

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Hybrid Maori/Pakeha

Explorations of identity
for people of mixed
Maori/Pakeha descent

Melinda Webber

Te Arawa/Ngapuhi/Pakeha

Table of Contents

	Abstract.....	3
Chapter one	Introduction.....	4
Chapter two	Placing myself in the research.....	14
Chapter three	Ethnic identity.....	19
Chapter four	Hybridity.....	34
Chapter five	Education and its influence on the development of ethnic identity.....	45
Chapter six	Methodology.....	53
Chapter seven	The participant stories.....	69
Chapter eight	Findings.....	99
Chapter nine	The key influences on ethnic identity development....	108
Chapter ten	Conclusion.....	134
References.....		140

Abstract

Explorations of identity for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent

The complexities involved in articulating an ethnic identity as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent are explored in this study. Issues related to establishing a sense of belonging that ties a person to both ethnic groups are examined based on the life narratives of six people of dual Maori/Pakeha descent. What does it mean to be a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand and in what ways are identities that reflect our dual heritage constructed? I use the term ‘our’ deliberately, because there is a place in the research for my own story as a ‘half-caste’ Maori/Pakeha.

Constructing and articulating ethnicity when there has been historical ethnic inter-marriage, as well as ethnic conflict in New Zealand is complex. Negative and stereotypical images are continually being constructed of Maori in a society that aims to assimilate *and* promote Maori as a homogenous group. It is not only important that Maori articulate and explore their own experiences and realities, but also significant that Maori/Pakeha, as members of both groups, have an opportunity to explore and control their own definitions beyond the constraints set by the dominant groups. The Maori cultural and political renaissance has involved defining Maori in terms of difference from Pakeha/Europeans, but this study explores the overlap – genetic, cultural, and social – between two ethnic groups and provides new insights into the diversity within the Maori ethnic group. The key question guiding the research was: **In what ways do people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent construct and articulate identities that reflect their dual heritage?**

This study aims to provide insights and understandings about the challenges, issues and benefits associated with being of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Chapter One

He Kupu Whakataki

Introduction

This study explores the complexity of constructing and articulating ethnic identity as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. It examines the key influences on ethnic identity development through both psychological and sociological lenses and provides insights into the impact that dual ethnicity has on self-concept. What does it mean to be a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand and in what ways are identities that reflect our dual heritage constructed?

In the study of identity, the terms race, culture and ethnicity are often used interchangeably to describe similar realities, yet they refer to three distinct categories of human experience. Prior to exploring the concept of ethnic identity the differences between these concepts need to be made. The definitions of all three are problematic in that they have enabled individuals in the dominant culture to study and consider culture without attending to the confusing and often incorrect use of each term in the discussion surrounding ethnic identity.

Race can be defined as a way of categorising individuals and population groups based on perceived biological or phenotypical differences such as skin colour (Marshall, 1998). Historically, the discourse associated with race has contributed to erroneous assumptions about individual and communal behaviour based primarily on biological classifications. While the term 'race' has no biological consequences, people's beliefs about race have profound social consequences. The race concept has been used as a political pawn by the power-dominant groups in maintaining the oppression of minority groups (Verma & Bagley, 1979). Race may not be the most salient factor in determining ethnic identity.

In contrast to the 'fixed' nature of race, culture has been defined as all the learned behaviours, beliefs, norms, and values that are held by a group of people and passed on from older group members to newer members (Hall & Du Gay, 1996). Similarly, McCarthy (2005) describes culture as all those things that people have learned to do,

believe, value and enjoy in their history. It is the totality of ideals, beliefs, skills, tools, customs and institutions into which each member of society is born (Bergin, 2000). The notion of culture is helpful in considering ethnic identity as a fluid and situational concept.

Ethnicity defines individuals who consider themselves, or are considered by others, to share common characteristics which differentiate them from the other groups in society. The term 'ethnicity' was coined in contradistinction to race, since although members of an ethnic group may be identifiable in terms of racial attributes, they may also share other cultural characteristics such as religion, occupation, language or politics (Marshall, 1998). An ethnic group is therefore a reference group called upon by people who share a common history and culture. Members are usually identifiable because they share similar physical features and values. Through interacting with each other and establishing boundaries with others, they identify themselves as being a member of that ethnic group.

According to Smith (1991), it is the sum total of group members' feelings about those values, symbols and common histories that identify them as a distinct group. Bergin (2000) states that membership of an ethnic group includes elements such as family structure, types of family roles men and women assume, belief systems that are ascribed to, value orientations that one is raised with, the language, ethnic signs and symbols, and reference group perspectives one shares with others. In this respect ethnic group membership covers more than racial identity. It includes the race of a person but is not limited by this factor alone. Lewis (2003) identifies five key markers of ethnic difference. She states that individuals and/or groups can be ethnically identified or ascribed status because of their: surname or nickname; cultural performances such as style, movement, dress, and knowledge base; proficiency in standard English, accent (thickness and type), use of slang; skin colour – both skin tone and other features such as hair and facial features and signals of social status such as dress, geographical location and mode of transportation.

Miscegenation

Another factor that is important when considering ethnic identity, particularly mixed ethnic identity, is the concept of miscegenation. Miscegenation is defined as the “...interbreeding of races, especially of white and non-whites” (Hawkins, 1983). Across cultures and time numerous acts of miscegenation and the creation of labels such as half-caste, half-breed, mulatto, hybrid, métis and chabine can be identified (Young, 1995). The altering of the essence of the original ethnic group and the associated impurity often carries a stigma, a sometimes subtle and not so subtle sense of inferiority. To be of mixed descent has been a matter of shame and social reproach in many cultures, something to be concealed if possible. In 1772 Edward Long wrote that miscegenation was “a venomous and dangerous ulcer that threatens to disperse its malignancy far and wide until every family catches infection from it” (Wilson, 1987). Terms for the offspring were ‘hybrid’ which meant crosses between species, and ‘mongrel’ meaning crosses between races, and neither had positive connotations (Young, 1995).

Many offspring of miscegenation have complex racial, ethnic and cultural identities, particularly those who are descendants of colonisation. It was through the category of race that colonialism was theoretically focussed, represented and justified in the nineteenth century and which fabricated a bipolar model of us/them, coloniser/colonised (Meredith, 1999a). Yet ironically it was also through racial relations that much cultural interaction was practised. Therefore, it needs to be acknowledged that other forms of racial distinction have worked simultaneously alongside this bipolar model, in particular those individuals identified as ‘half-castes’.

Throughout history, when previously isolated ethnic groups came into contact with each other there was some amount of inter-ethnic marriage. The appearance of ‘half-castes’ (this was the general term by which children of mixed parentage were known) amongst the populace of New Zealand began with the arrival of the first Europeans and the resulting miscegenation (Salmond, 1991). In the North Island half-caste children were seen in the late eighteenth century, but most mixed race families began in the 1830s and 1840s when early voyagers, whalers, sealers and traders took up temporary and permanent residence, acquired Maori women and became ‘Pakeha-Maori’ (Bentley 1999). These early European settlers adopted the customs and

language of their host communities and had many large healthy families (Bentley, 1999).

Nineteenth century New Zealand census data identified and separated out ‘half-castes’, an official indication that a mixed Maori–European population was becoming important (Brown, 1984). ‘Half-castes’ were defined as persons who reported half Maori and half European descent and were allocated to the Maori or European population according to their ‘mode of living’. Persons reported as more than half Maori were allocated to the Maori group regardless of their mode of living. It appears that decisions about what a half-caste actually was in practice and ‘what living as European’ meant when the Maori population itself increasingly dressed, worked and housed itself along European lines, were often open to interpretation (Brown, 1984; Pool, 1991). As in the United States, this category did not endure, and from the 1926 census all persons of half or more Maori descent were categorised as Maori (Kukutai, 2003).

Ethnic identity issues for mixed Maori/Pakeha in Aotearoa

The construction of an ethnic identity for individuals is a complex process and there is much debate about how this process takes place (Didham, Boddington, & Khawaja, 2004; Kukutai, 2003). Statistics New Zealand’s definition of an ethnic group has in recent years been very broad. As a result of its review of ethnicity statistics, Statistics New Zealand (2004) has proposed a new guiding definition. An ethnic group is made up of people who have some or all of the following characteristics:

- a common proper name
- one or more elements of common culture which need not be specified, but may include religion, customs, or language
- a unique community of interests, feelings and actions
- a shared sense of common origins or ancestry, and
- a common geographic origin.

This definition of an ethnic group, although widely used in Aotearoa, does not represent all cultural perspectives. According to Walker (1989) Taha Maori, that is

Maori ethnic identity, is a social concept based on descent from the aboriginal inhabitants of Aotearoa who regard themselves as ‘tangata whenua’, people of the land. Walker (1989) asserts that the basic component of Maori identity is ‘Maoritanga’. This concept incorporates racial traits such as skin pigmentation and cultural traits such as language, spiritual beliefs and identification with a particular tribe and geographic locality. As an extension of these influences, Broughton (1993) identifies a further three key elements of defining Maori identity as whanaungatanga (the family and kinship ties), te whenua (the land) and te reo (the language). Kilgour and Keefe (1992) also list three possible types of definition for Maori: biology, self-identification and descent. How much these various influences matter often depends on the reason why identity is being determined.

In considering ethnic identity, it is important to keep in mind that other groups, such as employers, landlords, teachers and the police, will also be constructing a person’s ethnicity. For instance, Xie and Goyette (1997) note that, for members of minority groups in the United States, choice about ethnicity is limited by labels imposed by other members of society or by custom. Waters (1996) also puts forward the view that minority groups have less flexibility in determining their ethnicity. Often this construction of ethnicity will be constrained or influenced by observable characteristics (Mason, 2001). This includes phenotypic expression of particular physical characteristics, such as skin colour or, at times, surnames. Yet physical characteristics and surnames can be misleading. For instance, when announcing a top female Maori scholar, Jackson (2003) focuses initially on physical characteristics, but notes, “Don’t be fooled by the blond hair and the green eyes. She’s Maori, really, and is our top scholar for the year” (p.22).

While ancestry often influences ethnic choices, in their research on mixed-heritage individuals in the United States, Stephan and Stephan (1989) found that ethnic identity was not necessarily associated with ancestry. Individuals may have ancestral ties with a group without identifying themselves or being identified by others as members of that group. Equally, some individuals may have no ancestral linkages with a group, but for a variety of reasons strongly identify with that group.

Dual Maori/Pakeha heritage and identity

The complexity of constructing ethnicity when there has been historical ethnic inter-marriage, as well as ethnic conflict, can be seen in New Zealand literature. In a poem entitled 'Race relations', Colquhoun (1999) lays out a complex set of components of ancestry, kinship and country of origin for the individual the poem is about. This background includes Australian, English, Scottish, German, Jewish and Maori roots. He notes that historically many of these groups have been in conflict with each other. Referring to his English and German background, he remarks that, "One half of me lost a war the other half won" (p.38). Similarly, describing Scottish and Maori connections, he writes, "Somewhere along the line / I have managed to colonise myself" (p.38). The construction of an identity that reflects a dual heritage is complex, but 'mixed' heritage can also be the linchpin to an ethnic and racial identity (Williams & Thornton, 1998).

O'Regan (2001) provides an example of how it is possible to recognise and value a mixed ancestry in New Zealand, but also to have a strong sense of identity with a particular ethnic group when she states "It is valid...for modern day Kai Tahu to have just as strong a sense of identity derived from their Maori heritage as from their Pakeha whaler or sealer heritage"(p.89). In a similar vein, Kukutai (2001) also argues that "Having a higher socio-economic status or acknowledging non-Maori ethnicity, does not make one any less Maori" (p.191). Jackson (2003) also discusses 'the part-Maori syndrome' which he suggests is an externally imposed concept. He argues that, "Maori have always defined 'Maoriness' in terms of whakapapa or genealogy. When children are born with whakapapa they are grandchildren or mokopuna of the iwi. They are Maori" (p.62).

Measuring and reporting the ethnic composition of New Zealand is an important part of an ongoing process of understanding our identity as individuals, as groups, and as a nation (Callister, 2004). Ethnicity (and, in some situations, ancestry) is a very important dimensional variable in policy-making (Kukutai, 2001). In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi creates a particular need for definitions as to who is Maori and who is not. However, ethnicity is not a human characteristic that can be easily

identified or measured. As with other countries, in New Zealand there is ongoing debate as to the best way of measuring ethnicity in data collections like the five-yearly Census of Population and Dwellings (Statistics New Zealand, 2004). In the New Zealand census, the census ancestry question relates only to Maori ancestry. As an example, in the 2001 census, a question asks whether the respondent is ‘descended from a Maori’. This is followed by the sentence, ‘That is, did you have a Maori birth parent, grandparent or great-grandparent, etc?’ (Statistics New Zealand, 2004). This type of question provides no information on ‘degrees of blood’. Given that only Maori ancestry data is collected, it is not possible to determine whether census respondents have dual or multiple ancestries.

For all ethnic groups, it is likely that based on ancestry alone, an even greater proportion of people would report two or more ethnic groups. Whilst this issue is not exclusive for Maori, it is more apparent due to the parallel recording of Maori ancestry (but no other ancestry) in the New Zealand census. Why do people record only one ethnic group when they could record more based on ancestry? First and foremost, ethnicity is about affiliation, which can be different to ancestry or descent. A second-generation ‘New Zealander’ with predominantly English ancestry, but a Dalmatian grandparent, may self-identify as just ‘European New Zealander’. There could be many reasons for such a simplification, including using the European identity to cover both options and considering the Dalmatian grandparent as overwhelmed by the English ancestry. This is also true of Maori whereby virtually all, if not all, have some non-Maori ancestry as a consequence of genetic mixing over the last 200 or more years (Butterworth & Mako, 1989).

Education as a key influence on ethnic identity development

Educational settings are sites of struggle that serve social interests and purposes (Edwards, 1999) and therefore have a profound effect on the development of ethnic identity. Competing interests struggle for domination as groups vie with each other in order to maintain their interests. Education for most Maori since the arrival of Pakeha has been a process of assimilation via policies and practices aimed at civilising ‘the noble savage’, but according to Edwards (1999) ‘civilisation’ facilitated cultural genocide in order to establish and maintain Pakeha groups’ power position over

Maori. The subsequent ‘european-isation’ of the education system and domination of English over Maori language, denied Maori cultural capital by rendering Maori language and culture ‘valueless’ in educational settings. The practices of corporal punishment further reiterated those value systems.

Formal education consequently became a site of institutionalisation and socialisation for Maori (Walker, 2004). Schooling for all New Zealanders has traditionally extended and built on Pakeha concepts of knowledge, values and socialisation only. Maori identity has remained personal, private, and has not been seen to be relevant in the mainstream, predominantly Pakeha world of education. New Zealand’s education system is therefore predicated on the reproduction of Pakeha culture (Walker, 1989). Walker (1989) states that the price of success in Pakeha terms is Maori cultural surrender and assimilation. Maori parents have claimed that within three weeks of a child arriving at a mainstream primary school, they exhibit negative attitudes towards Maori language and culture by suppressing it or losing it altogether (Walker, 2004). Schooling for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent is no different. The mixed Maori/Pakeha individual’s ambivalence over identity is exacerbated by an education system that is predicated on the reproduction of Pakeha culture, history and language. The impact of school as an ‘arena of cultural conflict’ (Walker, 1989) is, in itself, a historical and ongoing sociological component of dual Maori/Pakeha identity.

Schools play a role in the reproduction of race as a social category both through implicit and explicit lessons and through school practices (Apple, 1995). Children learn what it means to be a member of a specific race within the contexts of these institutions. Race is not merely a fixed characteristic of children that they bring to school and then take away intact, but something they learn about through school lessons and through interactions with peers and teachers (Lewis, 2003). Educational research that ignores these racialisation processes and treats race simply as a variable, reifies racial categories and misses the role schools play in the production and reproduction of race, ethnic identities, and ethnic inequality (Lewis, 2003).

In summary, this study aims to provide insights and understandings into the challenges, issues and benefits associated with being of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. A recurring response of many to my exploration is that somehow I have a problem

with my identity - an identity crisis - and that I am not quite sure who I am. By exploring issues of identity as a Maori/Pakeha myself, I do not mean to give the impression that I have an identity crisis. I am now quite clear who I am. I am a 'half-caste'. And I use this contentious term deliberately.

I am both Maori and Pakeha. At first this was very much an unconscious label that I 'picked up' as a child. The term 'half-caste dirty arse' was used flippantly by both Maori and Pakeha to label me as someone who did not fit into either group. I constantly walked the fine line of 'in-between-ness' in my childhood, feeling a sense of cultural limbo. However, in recent times I have reappropriated this label quite consciously as part of a project of defiance and resistance to those who would seek to reduce me to one or the other. It should therefore be noted from the outset, that a half-caste who is positive about her identity, leads this research. In this sense, by using the term 'half-caste', I concur with McDonald's (1975) analysis of such labels by suggesting that the Maori who use this term do not wish to represent an arithmetic measure of genetic material, nor a description of descent, but are instead claiming affiliation to two cultures, a claim to being bi-cultural.

However, I do not want to underestimate the tension and isolation that many people of mixed descent experience nor minimise what it means to have a sense of problematic ethnic identity. Because of language limitations and dislocation from their ethnic communities, many half-castes have limited choice in how they can express their dual ethnicity. But this is not the totality of the half-caste experience. The purpose of this study then is to explore what it means to be a half-caste Maori/Pakeha in contemporary New Zealand and in what ways identities that reflect a dual heritage are articulated.

This introduction has briefly outlined some of the key historical influences on the mixed Maori/Pakeha experience. Early inter-marriage and the resulting miscegenation has created a new group in New Zealand who deserve recognition as a legitimate and valued group in New Zealand society. This chapter has also discussed how historical conceptions of race continue to shape the ways society and individuals construct and articulate ethnic identity.

The next chapter will acknowledge the position I hold within the research by outlining my own story as a 'half-caste' Maori/Pakeha. Chapter three explores the construction of identity and more specifically ethnic identity. Chapter four then looks more specifically at hybridity theory and a range of perspectives on hybrid ethnic identity development. Chapter five discusses the role education plays in the development of ethnic identity. Chapter six outlines the research paradigms and methodology used in this study. Chapter seven is a presentation of the six participants' narratives. Chapter eight presents the two main findings of the research. Chapter nine is further discussion of the key influences on ethnic identity development for hybrid Maori/Pakeha. Chapter ten is the concluding statement and offers suggestions for further research.

Chapter Two

He tangata awarua au

Placing myself in the research

Because of the nature and design of this research it is important to acknowledge in a direct manner the position I hold within the research. Guided by Kaupapa Maori and critical theory and taking into account the purpose of the research, it is appropriate that I begin by explicitly locating myself within the study. I reject the ‘common sense’ notion that academics can, and should, write from a position of objectivity (Middleton & Jones, 1992). Jones (1992) argues that researchers must organise a space “for authors to reveal themselves legitimately in their work, to include our (*sic*) explicit subjective presence in their writing” (p.25). Similarly Clothier (1993) points out that, for Maori, it is part of an oral tradition which insists that one must identify oneself to one’s unknown audience. Clothier writes:

On introduction to a new audience the need to ‘position’ yourself, letting the listener/s know from where you come and thereby reminding yourself from whence you came, are part of an indigenous cultural tradition.

(p.10)

Therefore I tell my story following my cultural traditions - to enable the audience to gain a better understanding of the nature and origin of this research and to position myself as a subjective researcher. I also share my experiences to contribute and support the counter-stories offered by the participants. As Stanley and Wise (1990) remark:

We must explore such experiences from the inside ... not just as ‘researchers’ leeching on the experiences of others but unwilling to use our experiences as we do those of other people.

(p.39)

My Story

I was born 26 December 1973 in Auckland, New Zealand. I was born to Sharon Webber (nee Kake) and Michael Webber. My mother is of Ngapuhi descent, both Ngati Kahu and Ngati Hau. I place my feet firmly in both Whangarei and Pamapuria. My father is of Te Arawa descent, Ngati Whakaaue. I stand tall and strong at Ohinemutu, Rotorua. When people ask me who I am, or where I am from, that is my response.

I also, however, have strong Scottish links through my paternal grandmother Jean Webber (nee Burgess) to the McRae clan in the very north of Scotland and further links to Scotland and Ireland through my maternal grandmother Julie Latimer (nee Kenworthy). As a 33-year-old professional woman and mother I choose to be ethnically identified as Maori. Why? There are many contributing factors and experiences that have influenced this choice.

In a recent lecture I gave, I asked student teachers to talk to each other about childhood experiences that helped to shape their beliefs regarding diversity. Whilst talking with groups, I overheard a young woman at another table describe being called a ‘half-caste dirty arse’ as a child. This term of reference brought back streams of memories for me regarding my childhood. When I heard the term sung out in the playgrounds, local parks and even in my own backyard, it was a vivid reminder of my ‘in-between-ness’, of my not belonging to either group. Never once did I realise that it actually emphasised the fact that I *belonged* to two ethnic groups.

My parents separated when I was seven and my mother, brother and I went to live with my paternal grandparents in Koutu, Rotorua. At the time Koutu was a working class Maori community mostly made up of whanau (or so it seemed). Everyone in Maori culture is an aunty, uncle, nanny, koro or cousin, irrespective of whakapapa. I attended the same local school as my cousins where continuous reference to my fairness was a daily occurrence. I was asked regularly “Are you a *Maooooorrrri* (emphasis on the rolling r)?” When I answered ‘yes’, they would then ask me to say it and because I would get nervous I could never roll the r properly, it would come out

simply as '*Maori*'. That would then be seen as proof that I was not one of them and thus NOT a true Maori. Funny as it seems now, this experience highly influenced my perceptions of my ethnic self, my feelings of 'not-belonging', that stuck with me until adulthood.

At the age of 11 I went to live with my maternal grandparents in Howick, Auckland. Howick was a mono-cultural, scary place for a young Maori girl who had just started to understand her 'Maori-ness'. I had been encouraged to join a whanau kapahaka group prior to starting at school and was enjoying the new experience of learning about my culture, language and traditional practices. My mother's new husband was the kaiwhakaako and he was deeply pro-Maori. I learnt a lot during this time about both the liberation and pressure of belonging to an ethnic group – albeit one that was not particularly appreciated in the early 1980s. The liberating part came from being good at singing, poi and performance, and the pressure was again because of the constant reminders of my 'half-caste' status.

We spoke English at my house due to the ingrained beliefs of my grandparents that Maori was not a language that would get you anywhere (a roll-over from their native schooling). When my mother's husband rang the house, I would answer the phone 'Hello' and he would immediately hang up, and then ring back. This would go on and on until I finally, shamefacedly, answered 'Kia ora', to then be berated for being 'pakeha-fied'. I tried very hard to please both groups of whanau with regard to being a 'true Maori' for my mother and her new husband, and a Maori of whom my grandparents could be proud (that is, one who can 'make it' in the Pakeha world).

School also politicised me. It played a major role in the shaping of my perceptions of the world and the world's perception of me – as a Maori/Pakeha. As Helen Clothier (1993) so simply put it, "I am struck ... by the thought of being a product of the colonised and coloniser – an interesting whakaaro ne" (p.2).

School both exposed and subjected me to racism at both structural and individual levels. I was never taught about Te Tiriti O Waitangi, the importance of te reo Maori and New Zealand history, nor instructed in any way that was culturally familiar. I had

great difficulty relating to the mono-cultural context and content of schooling. I learnt very quickly that tikanga Maori and te reo Maori were not an appropriate korero at school unless you wanted to be stared at by the children or patronised by the teacher. 'Perhaps you would like to stand up and sing a waiata for the syndicate assembly?' 'Not on your life lady', I thought, the only Maori at the school, "I can't bear the isolation at lunchtime as it is!"

At secondary school I learnt te reo Maori formally and I learnt it quickly. I had heard Maori spoken around the home and at whanau hui since I was a child so I was able to contextualise a lot of the learning. Maori traditional practices regarding hui, tangi and whanau obligations were a normal and natural part of my childhood, as were Maori superstitions: don't sit on tables, don't cut your hair or nails after dark, and don't step over people's legs. These were all post-scripted with the statement 'or the kehua will get you'. I was raised to believe that either God or your tupuna were always going to catch you doing something naughty. Other key beliefs included: family comes first, share all you have, show humility, be hospitable at all costs, be strong (weakness was not tolerated except in the elderly) and be proud of your iwi and hapu (for they make you distinct from others). Our whanau's collective way of acknowledging and adhering to these beliefs helped me to identify with what I believed was a Maori way of being.

Whanau/community expectations, however, also hegemonised me and continue to do so. The expectations with regard to appropriate Maori behaviour, ways of talking, ways of being and traditions also make me feel alienated. To be Maori it seems that you have to accept, without question, the 'rules' surrounding appropriate Maori behaviour. I am not talking about marae kawa or mihimihi, but rather things like: Maori must stick together (and in some instances not have Pakeha friends); you are not a real Maori if you do not play sports or participate in music (and be exceptional at it); real Maori korero Maori; real Maori do Kapahaka; real Maori have a 'Maori-centred' way of doing things, and other unspoken ways of 'being' Maori. Unfortunately I do not fulfil many of these 'criteria' and thus have seldom felt like I fitted in.

Finally I would like to discuss the impact that being Maori has on my working life. There are both benefits and disadvantages to being Maori in tertiary education. A benefit is that I often have a different perspective on content/processes and appropriate assessment. The disadvantage is that my small voice is not heard amongst the many others (non-Maori) advocating content/processes and assessment tasks that contribute to Maori failure. A benefit is that I can contribute knowledge in both mainstream and Maori domains. The disadvantage is that in both domains I am a minority. A benefit is that I am often seen to be an approachable Maori academic for non-Maori. The disadvantage is that I am seen as a sell-out, or not 'Maori enough' by students from the Maori pathway. I seem to forever walk the path of 'in-between-ness'. I am often told how wonderful it must be to walk confidently in two worlds. But the reality is that I walk with trepidation in both worlds, constantly searching out a niche within which it is acceptable to be my kind of Maori - a Maori of my own definition.

So when asked why I don't identify as 'part-Pakeha', I answer, "because I feel Maori". To be Scottish or Irish in Aotearoa doesn't give me a real sense of belonging. I cannot stand on that whenua and feel my whakapapa surge through my body. I do not have people around me who korero those languages. I do not know the cultural expectations and behaviours associated with those cultures. I am Maori to my core.

This korero has been empowering because I have learned from the experience and have been able to share it with the other Maori/Pakeha participants. Yet this korero has also been painful because I have explored the issues and implications centred around aspects of not knowing 'who I am', of being lost, insignificant, of not belonging, of not fitting in and not being good enough. This korero has ultimately given credibility to those experiences.

Chapter 3

Ko wai tatou?

Ethnic Identity

Study of identity in New Zealand academic circles is fairly new (Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh, & Teaiwa, 2005) but for those who have struggled and continue to struggle in attempting to identify themselves, the complexity is ongoing. Many people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent face struggles in attempting to identify themselves, to unite and find sanctuary in either Maori or Pakeha societies that continuously define hybrid or half-caste others as different and inferior (Meredith, 2004). This study examines some of the key influences by which people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent construct ethnic identity.

Research into issues of ethnic identity involve a complex set of interwoven concepts and understandings. The concept of identity, as linked to the modernist understanding of the world, is that it is singular and unitary, but the postmodern view instead argues that identities are multiple, complex and continuously changing (Grieshaber & Canella, 2001). Acknowledging this complexity is to recognise that there is no single or exact measure of what constitutes ethnic identity, and that identity is dynamic and continuously evolving. Hall (1996) asserts that:

“Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power.”

(p.394)

Identities are also linked to society, power and circumstance, which in turn are linked to a person’s lived experiences. An individual’s various group memberships, based on gender, ethnicity, religion, class, race, sexual orientation, nationality, education and occupation, shapes their multiple lived experiences (Grieshaber & Canella, 2001). Postmodernism highlights the historical, political and societal grounding of individuals and groups, and recognizes the complex nature of individuals as members

of complicated, heterogeneous societies, giving us an opportunity to examine individuals and groups in their wider discourses and less confined identities (Grieshaber & Canella, 2001).

Identity, whether it is individual or collective, can be examined from a variety of different perspectives. Harris, Blue and Griffith (1995) describe identity as a sense of uniqueness and difference from others; “It is knowing who one is, and who one is not” (p.1). Although this quote refers to personal identity, it is also applicable to the ethnic identity held by a collective - knowing who one’s group is and who is not of one’s group. O’Regan (2001) states that is difficult to discuss the issue of collective identity without returning to the identities of the individuals within the collective. Personal and collective identities are different because they function at different levels in society.

The concept of ethnic identity can also be explained as a person’s sense of belonging (O’Regan, 2001), of knowing and understanding one’s individuality and place in the world. However, the formation and maintenance of an ethnic identity is a dynamic process. Two key processes influence ethnic identity development. Ethnic identity is a socially constructed phenomenon related to the societal context in which individuals live, but it is also very much a personal process. Erikson (1980) “understood that one’s identity is something that is both self-created and bestowed upon the individual by the culture” (p 13).

This inter-dependent development process is complex. A dichotomy exists between an identity developed within negotiated or discursive processes (where much of the identity is decided by others) and internal or individualistic processes (where much of the identity is realised independently). Modell (1993) believes that the dichotomy between the relatively self-sufficient self and the self that is dependent on others is normal. Sedikides and Brewer (2001) also define identity as compromising when they comment that:

... persons seek to achieve self-definition and self-determination (i.e. identity) in three fundamental ways: (a) in terms of their unique traits, (b) in terms of dyadic relationships, and (c) in terms of group membership.

(p.1)

Ethnic identity should “include[s] feelings of ethnic belonging and pride, a secure sense of group membership, and positive attitudes toward one’s ethnic group” (Phinney & Alipuria, 1996, p.142). Cuellar, Nyberg, Maldonado and Roberts (1997) view ethnic identity as a psychological construct reflecting aspects of our membership in, and identification with, a specific ethnic group. These authors note that ethnic identity development is a complex process involving perceptions, cognitions, and emotions relating to how individuals understand and relate to their ethnic awareness. According to Phinney (1989) ethnic identity development is a process that takes place over time as individuals explore and make decisions concerning the meaningfulness of their ethnicity in their lives. Individuals will attain an achieved ethnic identity only after they have explored their ethnicity and what it means to them, and they have accepted and internalized their ethnicity (that is, made a commitment). Phinney (1990) lists three features of ethnic identity: (1) a sense of belonging to a specific group, (2) exploration of the role of ethnicity in individuals’ lives and (3) acquiring and continuous maintaining of individuals’ cultural characteristics.

William Cross developed one of the first and most popular stage theories of racial identity development. Cross (1971) first published his Nigrescence model as a representation of the various stages individuals traverse in becoming Black oriented. As it was first presented, this model suggested that Black people move from a self-hating to a self-healing and culturally-affirming self-concept as their Black identity develops. However, his revised model now asserts that African Americans' self-esteem does not change much as they move through the stages of Nigrescence. Instead, African Americans' worldviews, ideologies and value systems change during Nigrescence. As a result, Cross now defines the process of Nigrescence as the transformation from a pre-existing (non-Afrocentric) identity into one that is Afrocentric (Cross, 1991). The revised Nigrescence model consists of five stages. The model can be used to analyse the critical incidents experienced in various institutions and the impact of these experiences on one’s sense of ethnic identity. The model will now be briefly explained, replacing the focus on Black identity development with a focus on Maori/Pakeha identity development.

In the *Pre-Encounter Stage* individuals downplay the importance of race in their lives and focus more on their membership of other groups (e.g. religion, social class, sexual orientation). Some people in this stage consider that race-based characteristics play an insignificant role in their daily lives, while others see race only as a problem that is linked to issues of social discrimination. The second stage of the Nigrescence experience, the *Encounter Stage*, is where individuals encounter an experience that causes them to challenge their current feelings about themselves and their interpretation of the condition of Maori people in Aotearoa. The experience is often one in which individuals face a blatant racist event. However, there are other instances in which the experience is more positive. In any event, the Encounter experience is one that is so foreign to people's previous worldviews regarding race that it forces them to rethink their attitudes about race.

In the *Immersion-Emersion* stage individuals immerse themselves in te ao Maori (Maori-ness) and feel liberated from Pakeha hegemony; they have positive feelings toward everything associated with Maori people and a negative view of those things associated with Pakeha people. Despite this immersion into all things Maori, individuals have not psychologically committed to a Maori identity.

The *Internalisation Stage* is described as a psychological change wherein individuals learn to balance their Maori-ness with the other demands of personhood (e.g. other group memberships). The final stage of the Nigrescence model, the *Internalisation-Commitment Stage*, involves commitment to a plan of action and individuals begin to live in accordance with the new self-image that they have developed.

Ethnic identity, ethnicity and ethnic groups

Although the terms ethnic identity, ethnicity and ethnic group appear frequently in the media, at work and in everyday situations, many New Zealanders lack a clear understanding of what these terms mean (Kukutai, 2003). Phinney and Alipuria (1996) define ethnicity by examining three constitutive aspects: culture, identity and minority status. Phinney (2003) states that ethnicity is a dynamic, multi-dimensional construct that refers to one's identity in terms of a subgroup that claims a common ancestry within a larger context and that shares culture, race, religion, language,

kinship or place of origin. These aspects are dimensions along which individuals vary rather than discrete categories. Ethnicity denotes a common tradition composed of shared values and customs, allegiance to particular group and national or regional traditions. It also represents the manner in which individuals include or exclude themselves from a group that shares a historical or familial relationship.

The relationship between race and ethnicity is often debated. In defining ethnicity, Phinney (1996) states that “the term ethnicity is also used here to encompass *race*” (p. 918; italics in original), a notion that Helms (1996) finds methodologically inappropriate. Helms, instead, argues that race is a more distinctive concept when compared with ethnicity and that race has a clear meaning as an ascribed racial category or phenotype, even when crudely assessed. Helms argues that ethnicity had no meaning apart from an alternative for race or immigrant status. Often, it is difficult to clearly separate race and ethnicity; for example, ethnicity seems to have different connotations and consequences for Whites than for members of other racial groups.

Waters (1990) observes that for Whites in the United States, ethnicity seems to be an optional part of identity, which they could choose to claim or not to claim. However, other racial groups often experience ethnicity as an imposed identity equated with subordination, inferiority, minority status and marginalization (Trimble, Helms, & Root, 2003).

In asserting that ethnic identity is significant for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent, it is also important that I acknowledge contrasting perspectives to this assertion. Rata (1996; 2005; Rata & Openshaw, 2006) critiques the popular culturalist discourse that emphasises the importance of ethnic identity. She states that ethnic identity is used as a vehicle for separatist ethnic politics by the ‘emergent neotribal elite’ (Rata, 2005). She argues that the current focus on what differentiates us, rather than what binds us, has resulted in greater ethnic division and presumed ethnic group rights. Rata (2005) critiques the emphasis on ethnic identity and ethnic group rights for two fundamental democratic reasons - the universality of the human race, and the individual, not the group, as the bearer of political rights. Rata (2005) emphatically argues that, “ethnicity has no greater claim to be the ‘essence’ of a person’s identity than does any other form of an individual’s socially-constructed

identity” (p.12). Like Van Meijl (1995; 1999) Rata feels that we need to rethink the way we reify the notions of ethnicity and culture and instead seek to “legitimise ethnic groups as they are, not in some mythic, primordial purity” (1995, p.318).

It is clear that there are a multitude of ideas about what ethnic identity constitutes, but most definitions derive from two distinct approaches – primordial and situational (Kukutai, 2001). Primordial definitions of ethnic identity tend to view ethnic identity as an unalterable and involuntary identity, arising from historically given factors such as ancestry, physical characteristics and birthplace. Geertz (1963) argues that the ties of blood, speech and custom permanently bind members of an ethnic group. Ethnic identity, in this respect, can be understood as an unchanging identity that is similar to race – the biological classification of human beings on the basis of genetic makeup. It certainly denies the New Zealand reality. Although entrenched in biology, primordial ethnic identity has avoided some of the negative associations of race such as using it to legitimate oppression based on perceived inferiority. However, race is now considered as more than a purely biological notion and includes cultural, social and economic characteristics as well as perceived physical differences (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). In this context, primordial ethnic identity and race are closely connected.

In contrast, situational ethnic identity bears little relation to the notion of race, emphasising cultural distinctiveness, self-identification and choice over ‘blood’ connections. Situational identity has been described as an identity of choice, acquired in a quest for material or intangible benefits (Glazer, Moynihan, & Schelling, 1975; Roosens, 1989). Max Weber (1968), for instance, believes ethnic identity to be a phenomenon that aids the process of group formation in the pursuit of social, economic or psychological rewards. According to Weber, ethnic identity is predicated on the belief in a common bond between individuals rather than an actual biological bond. Thus, people chose their ethnic identity to meet their personal and collective needs.

Frederick Barth (1969) does not believe that either of these two descriptions adequately encapsulate the totality of the human experience. He instead concentrates on the boundaries that define ethnic groups and group membership. He argues that

belonging to an ethnic group is neither arbitrarily defined nor based on unchangeable criteria. Rather, individuals can legitimately claim affiliation with different groups at different points in time (for example, change affiliation from Pakeha to Maori and vice versa). Expanding on Barth's work, Isajiw (1993) distinguishes between ethnic identity as it pertains to the collective (ethnic group) and to the individual (ethnic identity). He defines an ethnic group as a "community type group of people who share the same culture, or descendants of such people who may not share this culture but who identify themselves to this ancestral group" (p.411). Isajiw (1993) further states that ethnic identity is the way in which people, on account of their (real or symbolic) ethnic origin, locate themselves psychologically in relation to one or more social systems. This location of self also involves external behaviours such as language use and observance of customs.

The way in which Maori identity has been constructed in both traditional and contemporary societies will now be explored.

Maori identity

For Maori in Aotearoa, collective and individual identity formation has been shaped by a multiplicity of factors arising from ever-changing cultural and socio-political factors. The term 'Maori' itself attracts debate today because it is often used as a homogenising term for all tribal groups and therefore obscures the distinguishing characteristics of each tribe (Rangihau, 1975). Until about 1885 the term 'Maori' was used to distinguish Maori as 'normal or usual'. Maori used the word to describe themselves, as opposed to the 'different' European settlers (Walker, 1989). Before the arrival of Europeans, Maori had no name for themselves as a nation, only a number of tribal names. King (1985) defines 'Maori' as a derivative "from 'tangata Maori' meaning ordinary people" referring to the "descendants of the country's first Polynesian immigrants" (p.12). He writes that the term 'Maori' relates closely to "tangata whenua: people of the land; but with connotations of 'those who were here first' and host people" (King, 1985, p.109).

The term 'Maori' itself is not a primary term Maori use to describe themselves. They were, and are, a tribal people. They describe themselves according to their tribal

membership, rather than their national membership. They are Maori only in relation to Pakeha. Maori means 'normal', i.e. 'in relation to Pakeha, I am Maori'. These definitions indicate that 'Maori' was adopted initially to enable a linguistic differentiation between the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa and the early European settlers, the Maori and the other. 'Maori' and 'Pakeha' only came into being as identities in relation to each other. The definition of 'Maori' does not appear to have changed over time. However, the definition of the other, or 'Pakeha', has altered to some extent. This will be discussed later on in this chapter.

Maori identity is a social concept based on descent from the indigenous people of Aotearoa who regard themselves as tangata whenua (people of the land). Prior to the arrival of Pakeha, Maori identity was based on the concept of whakapapa that connected the individual to a common ancestor via whanau (family), hapu (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe) (Broughton, 1993). Walker (1989) states that another basic component of Maori identity is the concept of 'Maoritanga'. This concept incorporates racial traits such as skin pigmentation and cultural traits such as language, spiritual beliefs and identification with a particular tribe and geographic locality. Sir Apirana Ngata (Ngata, 1931) describes Maoritanga as:

...an emphasis on the continuing individuality of the Maori people, the maintenance of such Maori characteristics and such features of Maori culture as present day circumstances will permit, the inculcation of pride in Maori history and traditions, the retention so far as possible of old time ceremonial (sic), the continuous attempt to interpret the Maori point of view to the Pakeha in power.

(pp.176-177)

However, Rose Pere (1988) strongly resists the concept of 'Maoritanga' as an oversimplification of the diversity of Maori institutions and the vivacity of Maori people themselves. Her view aligns with those expressed by John Rangihau (1975) when he warned others against establishing hard and fast rules about Maori institutions and concepts:

There is no such thing as Maoritanga...Each tribe has its own way of doing things. Each tribe has its' own history. And its not a history that can be shared among others...I can't go around saying because I'm Maori that Maoritanga means this and all Maoris have to follow me...You can only talk about your Tuhoetanga, your Arawatanga, your Waikatotanga. Not your Maoritanga...they lose everything by losing their own tribal identity and histories and traditions”.

(p.198)

In his discussion of Maori identity Ritchie (1963) suggests there are twelve indicators of an authentic Maori; he asserts that they have:

- Loyalty to other Maoris (sic);
- Attachment to the land and community of one's ancestors;
- The recognition and observance of obligations towards kinsfolk;
- Generosity, sociability and co-operativeness, especially towards other Maoris and if necessary at the cost of personal gain (i.e. the practice of 'Maori *aroha*');
- Enjoyment of group activity;
- Faithful attendance at gatherings on the marae;
- Adherence to Maori ceremonial forms, especially at *hui*;
- Interest in *whakapapa* and Maori history;
- The use of the Maori language, at least ceremonially;
- A deliberately happy-go-lucky attitude to time and money;
- Refusal to worry over the future or plan too far ahead; and
- A taste for Maori '*kai*', foods gathered from the sea, forest or wilderness and/or cooked in a *hangi* (earth oven).

(p.94)

Metge (1964) similarly provides a scale that determines a 'degree of Maoriness' for individuals. Whilst Ritchie's (1963) indicators focus on observance of Maori cultural practices, Metge asserts that her scale measures two chief factors: cultural behaviour patterns which result from enculturation processes, and cognitive and literary factors concerned with the individual's knowledge of Maori culture, traditions and language.

Metge also states that the two factors might also be termed ‘Maori by enculturation’ and ‘Maori by choice’. Metge’s Maoriness scale lists the following criteria:

- Blood (three-quarters or more Maori)
- Visits marae often
- Would use the services of a tohunga
- Uses a Maori name
- Conversational Maori better than fair
- Maori is the home language half or more of the time
- Can name a traditional canoe
- Can name tribal and hapu affiliation
- Can name a meeting house
- Lives in a pa.

(p.38)

These primordial views of Maori identity emphasise the importance of things such as kin, community, solidarity, public ceremony and ritual symbolism, te reo Maori, knowledge of tikanga Maori and profound spirituality.

In contrast, Ballara (1998) argues that identity is not singular or fixed. Individuals and hapu often maintained multiple identities that were readily adaptable to changing political, social and geographical conditions (Ballara, 1998). The idea of Maori identity being changeable and dynamic is further emphasised by Walker (1989) when he critiques Ritchie’s (1964) ‘Maoriness’ scale of 1 – 12 and Metge’s (1964) list of twelve characteristics for ‘Maori ways’. Walker (1989) contends that these paradigms are too static and do not match with the dynamism of human nature. Walker argues that ‘Maoritanga’ is similar to ‘culture’ in that it is difficult to define by listing its major characteristics. Instead he asserts that Maoritanga could be defined broadly using a wide range of human phenomena specific to communities and groups of people. Maori identity is thus a dynamic social phenomenon that is open for discussion. These situational views of Maori identity emphasise self-identification, fluidity and the diverse realities of Maori people (Durie, 1995).

In both situational and primordial views of Maori identity, whakapapa is generally agreed to be the key characteristic. Karetu (1990) describes whakapapa as the glue that connects individuals to a certain place or marae, locating them within the broader network of kin relations. This in turn creates a sense of turangawaewae or belonging. Whakapapa is not simply about having ‘Maori blood’ but knowing about that descent and having a meaningful relationship to it. Thus, it is not only the “blood lines and physical landscapes we live in, but also the emotional landscapes constructed by loving grandparents or whanau” (Ihimaera, 1998). Stewart-Harawira (1993) however, has pointed to the exclusionary effect of whakapapa as articulated by Karetu and Ihimaera. She asserts that having Maori descent, as distinct from an intimate knowledge of one’s whakapapa, is sufficient grounds upon which to base Maori identity. As a result of urbanisation, many people of Maori ancestry are unable to trace the genealogy of their forebears. Yet this lack of knowledge should not preclude an individual’s claim to a meaningful Maori identity (Stewart-Harawira, 1993). Durie (1995) has pointed out the tension between primordial notions of what constitutes Maori identity and the diverse social realities in which most Maori operate daily. With this tension, he says that:

Far from being members of a homogenous group, Maori individuals have a variety of cultural characteristics and live in a number of cultural and socio-economic realities. The relevance of so-called traditional values is not the same for all Maori nor can it be assumed that all Maori will wish to define their ethnic identity according to classical constructs. At the same time, they will describe themselves as Maori and will reject any notion that they are “less Maori” than those who conform to a conventional image. (p.464)

Nevertheless primordial traits such as skin colour continue to be used as ethnic cues. Matahaere (1995), for example, argues that identifying as Maori nearly always carries with it an expectation of ‘looking like a Maori’. Thus, Maori feel obliged to somehow prove their Maoriness in order to be accepted in Maori domains. People of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent must negotiate inclusion two-fold – in both Maori and Pakeha contexts.

This raises an important issue with regards to ethnic identification – that self-identifying as Maori does not necessarily guarantee acceptance by others. This is particularly so when a person with no apparent or known Maori ancestry identifies as Maori, perhaps because they have been raised in a Maori familial environment, or have assumed the culture of a Maori spouse. Although ethnic identity is a matter of choice from a situational perspective, the reality is that possessing Maori ancestry or whakapapa is still perceived as requisite to any claim to ‘being Maori’. It is as important to explore ‘Pakeha identity’ as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent, as it is to define ‘Maori identity’. Defining Pakeha identity subsequently gives a reference point for discussing Maori identity, its origins and meaning in today’s society.

Pakeha identity

Pakeha is an indigenous New Zealand expression that derives from the traditional Maori word ‘*pakepakeha*’ - a mythological fairy people with pale skin (King, 1991). As an adjective, the word denotes ‘non-Maori’ and usually western or European phenomena, and as a noun it refers to people of predominantly European descent and fair skin. In common use ‘Pakeha’ is simply a descriptive word applied to non-Polynesian people and things in New Zealand that derive originally from outside New Zealand – most often Europe and even more specifically the United Kingdom. Who are Pakeha? According to Michael King (1991) Pakeha derive their identity primarily from their New Zealand location and experience rather than from the countries from which their ancestors emigrated; they often reject the notion that they are foreigners to New Zealand; and they regard their Pakeha culture as one that is becoming – like ‘Maoritanga’ – intrinsic to New Zealand.

European New Zealanders vary in their attitude toward the word Pakeha as applied to themselves. Some embrace it wholeheartedly as a sign of their ‘New Zealand-ness’, in contrast to the ‘European-ness’ of their forebears. Historian Judith Binney calls herself a Pakeha and says, "I think it is the most simple and practical term. It is a name given to us by Maori. It has no pejorative associations like people think it does - it's a descriptive term. I think it's nice to have a name the people who live here gave you, because that's what I am" (Barton, 2005). Others object to the word, claiming it to be derogatory or to carry implications of being an outsider, like the word ‘gaijin’ in

Japan (Callister, 2004). Those who ignore ethnic distinctions prefer to identify all New Zealand citizens only as New Zealanders (Webster, 2001)

According to Wetherell and Potter (1992), central to Pakeha identity is the general refusal to acknowledge history, a concept Wetherall and Potter term as a 'discontinuous view of history'. Using this logic, Pakeha are not the same people as the colonisers and cannot be held responsible for the ongoing impact of colonisation in the present. Bell (2004a) argues that the ideological function of this logic is to stop criticism, reject responsibility and ultimately maintain the status quo. This discontinuous view of history constitutes a gap in the construction of Pakeha identity. This in turn leads Turner (1999) to assert that Pakeha are a people 'without history', and without a culture or, at least, unsure of what it might be beyond pavlova and jandals. Turner (1999) further states that the logic of 'living without history', or forgetting the process of colonisation and settlement is that "[s]ettlers do not think they are immigrants, or conceive of their culture as diasporic, and prefer to think they are indigenous, while distinguishing themselves from aboriginal people" (p.22). Turner (1999) states that this is a recognisable theme of Pakeha identity and asserts that there are costs in continuing to "accept and enjoy the fruits of a repressed cultural psyche"(p.37). He argues that denying history is not to know oneself and thus Pakeha identity remains undeveloped and inarticulate. Turner also suggests that while history is repressed, it is destined to repeat itself. Bell (2004) supports this view when she states, "...until Pakeha engage with their colonial history, their relations with Maori will remain locked within a colonial dynamic" (p.93).

Maori/Pakeha: the emergence of a new identity

From the earliest contact, there were liaisons between Maori and Pakeha. The result was a visible minority of Maori with European paternity (Belich, 2001). Until 1926, these 'half-caste' Maori/Pakeha were allocated to the Maori or European populations according to their mode of living (Brown, 1984; Pool, 1991). However, as contact with Europeans increased and Maori began to emulate European style dress, customs and living styles, it became increasingly difficult to distinguish 'half-castes' on the basis of their way of life. The dogged belief in racially determined differences gave rise to increasingly refined categories ranging from 'full Maori' to 'three-quarter

caste', 'half-caste' and 'quarter-caste'. From 1926, all people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent were classified as Maori, irrespective of their mode of living, while those with 'less than half' Maori blood were counted as European (Kukutai, 2003).

The associations of 'purity', 'essence' and 'tradition' that accompany the notion of authentic ethnic identity have negative effects on self-concept, to the extent that they exclude, discredit or 'de-authenticate' people with hybrid identities (Herring, 1995). 'Maori-ness' has become associated with fixed indicators of ethnicity and since people of mixed Maori/Pakeha heritage no longer necessarily look, speak or live traditionally, they are deemed no longer 'real Maori'. Patrick Wolfe (1994) illustrates how this 'repressed authenticity' works against the interests of hybrid indigenous people by creating a divide between the *authentic*, te reo-speaking, rural-dwelling, tribal Maori and the *inauthentic*, English-speaking, urban-dwelling Maori who may not know their tribal background. Thomas (1994) further states that the construction of 'authentic' (or primordial) Maori identity models marginalises most people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent who must negotiate identities in urban *and* rural contexts, with non-traditional *and* traditional social relations, institutions, and work environments, in both Maori and Pakeha environments.

Despite the difficulties in identifying with two ethnic groups, acknowledgement of dual Maori and Pakeha descent is becoming more common in census reports and surveys (Kukutai, 2001). According to Khawaja, Boddington, and Didham (2000), the desire to acknowledge both parents can be a compelling reason to give a multiple response. Identifying with one side of the family only might engender a sense of disloyalty and fail to capture the complexity of 'personal ethnic space' (Khawaja et al., 2000). This is especially likely for a child who is exposed to the physical characteristics, broader familial networks and cultural environs of both parents. However, Chapple (2000) argues that intermarriage will decrease the importance of cultural distinctions in the future, as children of mixed marriages become progressively less likely to affiliate with a single ethnic group.

In this chapter a number of perspectives regarding ethnic identity development have been compared and contrasted. It has highlighted the complex nature of 'laying claim' to a particular ethnic identity and consequently negotiating inclusion in that chosen

ethnic group or groups. It is not only important that Maori articulate and explore their own experiences and realities, but also significant that Maori/Pakeha, as members of both groups, have an opportunity to explore and control their own definitions beyond the constraints set by the dominant groups.

In the next chapter the notion of ethnic/cultural 'hybridity' is examined.

Chapter 4

He tangata awarua

Hybridity

In the last chapter, the issues associated with ethnic identity development were discussed. In this chapter, the more specific complexities related to hybridity are examined. What is to become of the hybrid person who does not fit into one of society's designated ethnic categories? This is the dilemma faced by people who are both a part of, and between, two distinct races. This inability to 'fit' into society's racial categorisations results in difficulty determining dual status, responsibilities and positions relative to both racial groups. Thus, the hybrid person is often forced to occupy an 'in-between' position, or negotiate many 'border crossings'. This form of marginalisation often results in complexity articulating an ethnic identity.

Much of the work that discusses hybridity has been written in contexts that involve non-white migrant minorities trying to achieve status in predominantly white societies (Anzaldúa, 1987; Chambers, 1994; McRoy & Freeman, 1986; Tizard & Phoenix, 2002). In New Zealand, the situation is reversed. Aotearoa/New Zealand has a white, migrant majority and an indigenous minority. Due to New Zealand's colonial history, the subsequent assimilation and more recent revitalisation of Maori language and culture, the current idea of celebrating hybrid identities has been viewed with suspicion by some Maori. It can be seen as a further denial of distinctive Maori identity and a continuation of the colonial practice of assimilation. Thus, in the context of this study, the politics of hybridity theory and the notion of 'hybrid identity' are complex.

In the nineteenth century, as in the late twentieth century, hybridity was a key issue for cultural debate. The word 'hybrid' developed from biological and botanical origins: in Latin it meant the offspring of a tame sow and a wild boar (Parker & Song, 2001). Alternatively, the Oxford English Dictionary defines a 'hybrid' as the 'offspring of two different species or varieties' (Hawkins, 1983). The term hybrid was scarcely used until the nineteenth century, when it was used to refer to a physiological

phenomenon. In the twentieth century it is more likely to be used to refer to a cultural phenomenon – to refer to people of mixed racial or ethnic descent. The use of the term ‘hybridity’ today prompts questions about the ways in which contemporary thinking has broken absolutely with the racialised formulations of the past. The historical belief in racially determined differences gave rise to increasingly refined categories for dual Maori/Pakeha in Aotearoa ranging from full Maori to three-quarter caste, half-caste and quarter-caste (Kukutai, 2003).

Hybrid individuals can present a quandary for the either/or racial classifications used in society (Kukutai, 2003) because their racial identities encompass more than one designated category. As Williams (1999) suggests, the social and psychological implications resulting from the lack of affirmation and validation for dual descent can make defining oneself racially especially difficult. Because of society’s history of categorisation, people of mixed descent have been neglected, thus leaving them in a state of marginality because they are so often forced to choose only one racial identity when there is a need to recognise all aspects of their heritage (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Spickard & Burroughs, 1999; Tizard & Phoenix, 1993, 2002).

Despite the increase in mixed race populations, institutions collecting demographic information still fail to recognise ‘mixed descent’ status as a separate racial category and continue to challenge people of mixed descent to choose one ethnic group (Kukutai, 2003). The subsequent labelling uses ambiguous terminology and thus the individual is forced to select ‘other’ to denote the complexity of their heritage. This inability to ‘fit’ into society’s racial categorisations results in difficulty determining dual Maori/Pakeha status, roles and positions relevant to both racial groups (Brown, 1990). Bell (2004b) argues that the particularities of cultural identity politics in Aotearoa New Zealand make the wide acceptance of hybrid identities difficult. She notes two factors in particular. Firstly, hybridity has a long association with Pakeha desires for Maori to assimilate to Pakeha culture – thus, many Maori treat this identification choice with suspicion. Secondly, the rhetoric of bi-culturalism with its positing of two distinct cultures, cannot easily accommodate hybrid Maori/Pakeha identities.

Seminal theorists such as Park (1928, 1931) and Stonequist (1937) have written about hybrid or mixed heritage people since early last century. In 1928 Robert Park, a Harvard sociologist, introduced the concept of 'the marginal man' to describe the predicament of those "destined to live in two cultures and two worlds" who inevitably experienced a divided self (p.881). But, while the marginal man was condemned by fate to live in two antagonistic cultures, Park stressed that this position brought great benefits. The marginal man can look "with a certain degree of critical detachment" (p.881) on both cultures, and is thus a citizen of the world. Inevitably, Park argues that his horizons are wider, his intelligence keener, his viewpoint more rational, than those of people who live within one culture. Nevertheless, culturally and socially, marginal persons were said "to live in limbo" (Park, 1928, p.881), forever negotiating their place, position and right to be a part of both ethnic groups.

Park (1931) applied the concept of hybridity to people who live on the margin of two races. It is this position in society, and not heredity, that he believed "makes the mulatto more intelligent, restless, aggressive, and ambitious than the negro (sic)" (p.881). In support of this argument, he pointed out that two eminent Black American leaders, Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. du Bois were both 'mixed bloods' (Park, 1931). Park believed that marginal people are bi-ethnic and bi-cultural, endowed with the ability to identify with more than one culture and acquire a wide range of competencies and sensitivities (Owusu-Bempah, 2005).

Park's ideas were elaborated upon by a colleague, Everett Stonequist (1937). Unlike Park, however, Stonequist saw little that was positive in the marginal situation. His major contributions were to analyse the psychological difficulties marginality created and to add a developmental dimension. Stonequist (1937) argued that there is a life cycle in marginality. In the first phase of the cycle marginal individuals are not conscious, or are only dimly conscious, of their difference from the dominant class. This is termed the 'pre-marginal' stage. In the second phase a crisis occurs. Through some act of rejection, people of dual descent become aware that they are marginal; that is, that in the eyes of white people, with whom they are at least partially identified, they belong to an inferior and despised group. This phase is termed the 'marginal' stage. This situation is inherently painful, and at its minimum consists of

feelings of isolation, of not quite belonging anywhere, and at its extreme, of feelings of despair (Stonequist, 1937).

Living in two social worlds, between which there is antagonism and prejudice, he (sic) experiences in himself the conflict.

(Stonequist, 1937, pp.24-25)

In the third stage, or 'stage of adjustment', the half-castes attempt to escape from the painful state of marginality by 'adjustment'. They may decide to become fully absorbed in the white group by 'passing' as white, where this is a possibility. Alternatively, they may decide to become assimilated into the black group, although to do so they will have to overcome their negative feelings towards black people and the distrust and hostility of black people towards themselves. Some may choose to remain marginal, in which case Stonequist believes they are "forever condemned to feel isolated and rejected by both groups" (p.138). Stonequist believes this state is likely to lead to delinquency or despair, although a few individuals will be strong enough to live with their social isolation and insist on their dual status in both groups, maintaining, "I refuse to deny myself" (Stonequist, 1937, p.138). Stonequist (1937) asserts that there are no biological problems with race mixture, only societal problems.

In contrast, Tizard and Phoenix (1993) argue that marginal individuals are not alienated, but, on the contrary, feel the pull of both cultures. They experience a divided self because they internalise the attitudes of both groups towards each other. Children of mixed descent are still described by many as being unable to deal with their dual biological and cultural heritage. Many believe that they are torn between conflicting cultures, and are confused. Their rejection by either or any 'racial' group means that they are marginal, wretched and outcast, left to be the targets of both their parents groups' anger and hatred for one another, the ridicule of others and the pity and charity of sympathetic others (Owusu-Bempah, 1994, 1997).

Hall (1992), amongst others, challenges Stonequist's view of marginality. In Hall's (1992) view, Stonequist made no distinction among marginal persons, marginal status, and marginal personality. According to Hall (1992), a marginal person is

biologically or culturally from two races or cultures, whereas marginal status exists when an individual occupies a position somewhere between cultures, but does not wholly belong to either. One has a marginal personality when one has trouble dealing with the marginal status position, is torn between cultures, and develops psychological problems. These distinctions suggest that the mere fact of having marginal status does not automatically or necessarily lead to a marginal personality. Both Te Rangihiroa (Sir Peter Buck) and Sir Apirana Ngata were aware of the work of these theorists, discussed them, and were themselves identified as ‘hybrids’ to some (Ngata, Buck, & Sorrenson, 1986). While Ngata (who had a Pakeha /European grandmother) was publicly opposed to miscegenation, that is, inter-marriage and the continued dilution of Maori language and culture, Te Rangihiroa acknowledged the strengths and benefits of his own mixed heritage (Beaglehole & Beaglehole, 1946).

Recent writing in the area of post-colonial and cultural studies includes the work of Homi Bhabha (1994b), who acknowledges the ‘impossibility of culture’s containedness’ and the existence of the ‘partial’, ‘in-between’ cultures which are both baffling like those they spring from and yet different (p.59). Bhabha describes the concept of hybridity emerging from such partial cultures, which refuse the binary representation of social antagonism and construct new visions for community: versions of historic memory and narrative forms – a ‘third space’. Similarly, Bakhtin and Holquist (1981) describe hybrids as having two voices, two languages, two consciousnesses, two epochs; being situated at “the collision between differing points of view on the world” but also having been “profoundly productive historically” and “pregnant with potential for new world views” (p.360).

The concept of ‘third space’ to issues of Maori/Pakeha identity in Aotearoa, New Zealand is also applied by Meredith (1999b). He argues that cultural politics in Aotearoa have become oversimplified and essentialised into binary opposites – Maori as colonised and Pakeha as colonisers. He argues that these are adversarial and artificial polarities based on exclusion and purity. Meredith instead advocates a shift towards recognising multiple subject-positions, affinities and differences in ongoing interaction and exchange in Maori/Pakeha relations and the opening up of a third space in which new forms of cultural meaning can be created and the limitations of existing boundaries can be blurred.

While the Maori renaissance since the 1980s has involved the development of many models of identity which aim to express an ‘essence’ of being Maori, there is a strong argument against the assumption that each culture has a unique, fixed, primordial essence that can be grasped independently of context or inter-cultural relations (Modood, Beishon, & Satnam, 1994). Caglar (1997) argues that:

“A growing number of people define themselves in terms of multiple national attachments and feel at ease with subjectivities that encompass plural and fluid cultural identities. Attempts to theorise the lifestyles pursued by such people...highlight the inadequacy of commonsense assumptions about culture as a self-contained, bounded and unified construct.”

(p.10)

In recent times the concept of hybridity has been re-appropriated from negative racial discourse to represent a more open-minded view of self-identification. Hybridity, defined generally as forms of mixture and combination resulting from cultural contact, is now considered in a positive light as the process by which all identities develop and change over time (Bell, 2004b). Such mixing is argued to be the inevitable reality of cultural identities in our increasingly multi-cultural societies rather than being associated with degradation. In very general terms, Bell (2004) states that this reversal of the status of hybridity, from negative to positive, is in itself a political act – a rejection of racialised differences.

Similarly, Paul Meredith (1999a) seeks to reappropriate the term half-caste from its older negative connotations. He asserts that he does not identify as a half-caste because he is biologically constructed 50/50 per cent Maori/Pakeha, but rather because his father is Pakeha and his mother is Maori. Meredith is also critical of the way current New Zealand politics encourages a distinct promotion of separateness between New Zealand Maori and Pakeha. Meredith (1999) instead argues that we need to remember our affinities and build relationships with each other. He states that self-proclaimed hybrid individuals or ‘cultural lubricants’ can make an important contribution to this change in thinking because they have the advantage of “...intentionally straddling both cultures with the ability to lubricate, that is, to

translate, negotiate and mediate affinities and differences in a dynamic of exchange and inclusion” (p.24). Meredith’s (1999) concern with hybridity is thus politically motivated by the desire to improve relationships and understanding between Maori and Pakeha (Bell, 2004b).

In the context of interviews with individuals of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent, Heeni Collins (1999) developed a concept called ‘Nga Tangata Awarua’. She states:

Awarua can mean either the flowing of two rivers, a corridor or passage. Hence it includes meanings of dual heritage, possible discomfort/alienation of being in-between [and] the concept of transition.

(p.5)

Collins (1999) draws attention to difficulties in the status of ‘in-between’ and refers to the experience as “moving from one side to the other, rather than occupying an in-between position” (p.5). While Meredith (1999) posits the benefits of being a ‘cultural lubricant’, Collins’ (1999) research acknowledges, indeed emphasises, the complexities and tensions experienced by people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent as they negotiate their identities between the Maori and Pakeha worlds. This research recognises the issues regarding the pressure in society for individuals to take a stand on one side or the other of the bi-cultural divide. It is this pressure, “...arising out of mutual anxieties and antagonism and out of Maori desires to resist assimilation, that make the hybrid position difficult to occupy” (Bell, 2004b).

Collins’ (2004) later research on hybridity found that most Maori are forced to become bi-cultural and adapt to colonisation far more than Pakeha have had to become bi-cultural and adapt to Maori society. People of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent usually have an increased opportunity (compared to sole Maori or sole Pakeha) to become socialised and enculturated in both societies. Collins’ (2004) research also found that people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent experienced racism in various forms: Pakeha (or other) racism towards them as Maori; Maori racism towards them as (perceived) Pakeha; and the suspicion or distrust of individuals towards them as dual heritage Maori/Pakeha. She states that the challenge for most

people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent is developing a belief in themselves as Maori and hence developing cultural/ethnic identity strength. Collins' (1999) parting comment is to remind us that "straddling both worlds is not always a comfortable position, especially if neither foot is firmly placed" (p.1). Many people in Aotearoa do not feel secure even in one of these worlds, let alone in both.

Kelly Bevan (2000) also acknowledges the difficulties of occupying an in-between or both/and position. She states that 'white Maori' have historically been labelled by both black and white communities as not possessing enough blood quantum to belong to either. Her research involved white Maori women participants identifying factors which influence identification and traditional cultural markers of identity (which are important when there are no visible signs of tangata whenua status). Bevan (2000) found that when selecting an identity, white Maori face the imbalance of power contained within the identities. She states:

One is powerless and has been colonised to the point of cultural extinction and the other is from the majority group who did the colonising and who maintain power by using criteria of difference to retain purity of race.

(p.110)

Bevan (2000) asserts that there are two options in relation to identification for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. One option supports identifying with dual identities and switching between them as situations demand. Most would assert this is a healthy process, which avoids denial of aspects of one's identity (Meredith, 1999a; Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Spickard & Burroughs, 1999; Tizard & Phoenix, 1993). Bevan, however, argues that this "manoeuvring amongst several identities inclusive of an indigenous heritage" further disempowers an already disadvantaged tangata whenua identity (p.111). She argues that the dual or multiple identity option does not offer full development of the Maori cultural identity in a predominantly Pakeha society but instead requires that Maori further integrate the western identities. Bevan, instead, supports option two, which advocates singular tangata whenua identification as both a healthy and political identity option for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. She believes that choosing to identify as Maori will boost the population and thus help halt the processes of assimilation. Bevan's preference

promotes Maori identity rather than a hybridised position across Maori/Pakeha identities. Bevan's (2000) concern with hybridity is thus politically motivated by the need for Maori distinction and resistance to assimilatory pressures.

In contrast to Bevan's (2000) advocacy for Maori identity only, Avril Bell (2004b) believes that the existence of hybridised identities should open up a space between essence(s) and identity so that there is a degree of choice in the identities an individual might choose; people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent may choose to follow Meredith's (1999) path, Bevan's (2000) path or some other possibility. Bell (2004) points out that people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent will generally make this choice based on upbringing and experience. They will subsequently choose an identity that they feel best 'fits' their sense of self and sometimes their commitment to an overt political project. Bell (2004) argues that these decisions are never made as a matter of free will. "Our 'choices' are always constrained by the politics of our social context" (p.135). She is sympathetic to Meredith's cultural lubricant concept because she believes that a focus on cross-cultural relationships could offer a crucial corrective to old colonial ways of operating. Thus Bell (2004) values hybrid Maori/Pakeha identity as a means of coming to terms with our history and negotiating and reconstructing our relationships with each other.

The specific context of being a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in Aotearoa is unique and complex. The Maori/Pakeha hybrid lives the daily contradiction of being positioned as indigenous as well as a variant of Pakeha, thus straddling two distinct ethnic groups and ethnic identities. Both hybridized and 'authentic' Maori identities are subsumed beneath an imposed colonial identity because cultural politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand are concentrated and contested around the duality of Maori (the colonised) *or* Pakeha (the coloniser), over-simplified and essentialised. The divisive categories of 'us/them', 'either/or' have alarmingly found an increased currency resulting in antagonistic polarisation premised on exclusion and purity. Hence, Maori who are viewed as half-caste are seen to be 'contaminated' with Westernism (Meredith, 2004). They are perceived to be privileged with Pakeha beliefs, values, practices and norms and are often seen as 'colonised' Maori; disenfranchised and alienated from their past, they are assumed to be separated from their traditional roots. What is required is a far more critical perspective of Maori/

Pakeha relationships and identities in New Zealand that rethinks our assumptions about culture and identity from 'us' and 'them' to a more mutual sense of 'both/and' (Meredith, 1999b). Thus I believe that we must acknowledge and negotiate not only difference but also connection.

In a similar vein to Bhabha (1994a) I believe cultural hybridity to be:

... the process by which the colonial governing authority undertakes to translate the identity of the colonised (the Other) within a singular universal framework, but then fails, producing something familiar but new...a new hybrid identity or subject-position emerges from the interweaving of elements of the coloniser and colonised, challenging the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity.

(p.270)

I believe Bhabha's (1990) conception of hybridity is capable of explaining the unique social construction and position of hybrid Maori/Pakeha in New Zealand. He argues that:

...(T)he importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original movements from which the third emerges; rather hybridity... is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom...the process of cultural hybridity gives rise to a something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation.

(Rutherford, 1990)

The third space is a mode of articulation, a way of describing a productive, and not merely reflective, space that brings about new possibility. It is a space of negotiation, interrogation and self-determination; that is, it produces new forms of cultural meaning that blur the limitations of existing boundaries and call into question established categorisations of culture and ethnic identity. According to Bhabha

(1994a), this third space is an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation is fluid and dynamic.

The existence of multiple realities of the human experience because of ethnic diversity cannot be disregarded, which means that the stories and life experiences of hybrid people must be heard and acknowledged in order to better understand their ethnic identity development. Thus the concept of a 'third space' is liberating in that it opens up a new way of thinking about New Zealand culture. It is emancipatory in that its existence releases hybrid individuals from a sense of unbelonging, dislocation and alienation, and instead gives them a sense of partial participation and location within their cultures of origin. It also provides a platform upon which the hybrid Maori/Pakeha can straddle two different and often opposing cultures. This 'third space' opens up a new category of cultural location where hybrid Maori/Pakeha can constantly negotiate their ethnic identity in relation to their unique historical circumstances as native/colonial, colonised/coloniser and Maori/Pakeha.

The next chapter explores whether or not identities that reflect a dual heritage are constructed through participation in school and university.

Chapter 5

He whakaakoranga

Education and its influence on the development of ethnic identity

This chapter will explore the role education plays in the formation of ethnic identity for people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. In what ways are identities that reflect a dual heritage constructed through participation in school and university?

Schools play an important role in both challenging and reproducing conceptions of ethnic identity (Apple, 1979, 1995; Giroux, 1983). They are a place where groups which otherwise may have little contact come together. Schools are also a place where people can learn about themselves beyond the context of their immediate family, where children have a chance to learn about, and hopefully learn to value, difference. As a context for learning, schools also offer the possibility for new realities. Examining the role that schools play in ethnic identity development challenges us “not merely to document what is but begin to imagine how it might be better” (Lewis, 2003). Only through education, through the acquisition of knowledge and skills, do people have the potential to acquire the ability to challenge ‘what is’. Furthermore, through learning and education, there is the potential to see what is and to recognise it as a problem. For people of mixed descent this means remembering their ethnic and cultural specificity and consequently constructing and articulating a positive ethnic identity.

Early awareness of ethnic identity

Awareness of ethnic identity and ethnic difference often begin in early childhood (Morland & Hwang, 1981). We know from social psychological research (Rogoff, 2003) that the development of ethnic identity is very context dependent, especially in the early years. Children who attend ethnically diverse schools or reside in ethnically diverse communities are much more likely to become aware of ethnic identity at an earlier age than children in more homogeneous settings (Cross, 1991; Phinney, 1990; Tatum, 1992). Interacting with children from other racial and ethnic backgrounds in a society that has historically treated ethnic identity as a means of distinguishing groups

and individuals often forces young people to develop ethnic identities early. However, prior to adolescence they are unlikely to understand the political and social significance associated with their ethnic affiliations (Noguera & Wing, 2006). For young children, being a person with a different skin colour may be no more significant than being thin or heavy, tall or short.

In adolescence, the awareness of ethnic identity and its implications for individual identity become more salient. According to Erikson (1968), as children enter adolescence they become extremely conscious of their peers and seek out acceptance from their reference group. They become increasingly aware of themselves as social beings and their perception of self tends to be highly dependent on acceptance and affirmation by others. For some adolescents, identification with and attachment to peer groups takes on so much importance that it can override other attachments to family, parents, and teachers (Noguera & Wing, 2006).

It is not uncommon in multi-cultural settings for pre-adolescent children to interact and form friendships easily across ethnic boundaries - if their parents or other adults allow them to do so (Troyna & Carrington, 1990). However, as young people enter adolescence, such transgressions of ethnic boundaries can become more problematic. As they become increasingly aware of the significance associated with group differences, they generally become more concerned with how their peers will react to their participation in particular cultural groups and they may begin to self-segregate (Noguera & Wing, 2006). As they participate in educational institutions, young people also become more aware of the politics associated with ethnic identity, becoming more cognisant of ethnic hierarchies and prejudice, even if they cannot articulate what it means (Noguera & Wing, 2006).

Cognisance of our ethnicity is not something with which we are born but is something that is mapped onto us from the first moments of life (with the listing of race on the birth certificate) (Lewis, 2003). Ethnic identity does not automatically follow from these early external racial assignments. An ethnic identity instead takes shape over time through multiple interactions including family socialisation, participation in ethnic-specific domains (for example marae) and exposure to the media, school, and other ethnic groups (Lewis, 2003).

Schools as race-making institutions

In schools, ethnicity cannot tell teachers about students' innate proclivities to learn, to work hard, or to succeed. It cannot provide information about whether their parents care about schooling or believe in hard work. Nor can ethnicity provide an insight into the 'cultural needs' of ethnic minority students. To say that a child's ethnicity can tell us these things insinuates that children from specific ethnic backgrounds are homogenous. So why does participation in education play such a significant role in ethnic identity development?

Racialisation, the formation of understandings about race, is exacerbated in the school context (Lewis, 2003). These processes include how students are ethnically categorised, how boundaries between their ethnic groups are formed, negotiated and interpreted and how the processes of racialisation and boundary-forming affect student's interactions and opportunities. In this way schools can be considered racially-coded spaces (Lewis, 2003). Schools are spaces where ethnic politics function to racialise and are significant in the production and reproduction of race, ethnic identities and ethnic inequality. According to Lewis (2003) one's ethnic ascription has the power to shape life's chances.

Schools are contexts where we "*make* each other racial" (Olsen, 1997). Not only are schools central places for forming ethnic identities, but they are key places where we rank, sort, order and differently equip our children along ethnic lines even as we hope for schooling to be the great societal equaliser. The way we talk, interact and act in school both reflects and helps shape our understandings about ethnic hierarchy. This hierarchy in schools is exacerbated through the distribution of funding, through the differentiated expectations that teachers hold regarding the abilities of different ethnic groups and through an institutional choreography of everyday actions incessantly funneling opportunities to some students and not others (Fine, 1997).

For educators understanding the process through which young people come to see themselves as belonging to particular ethnic groups is important because it has tremendous bearing on the so-called 'achievement gap'. However, many Maori students continue to fare poorly in today's classrooms, especially when compared to

their non-Maori counterparts (Bishop, 2003). The under-achievement of Maori students in mainstream settings should be a priority for the New Zealand government, particularly given that over 85% of Maori students are currently in the mainstream or general school system rather than in Kura Kaupapa or other Maori medium settings.

There are different opinions among researchers about how and why a correlation between ethnicity and achievement exists (Bevan-Brown, 2003; Bishop, 2003; Bishop, Berryman, & Richardson, 2001; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Fordham, 1996; Macfarlane, 2004; Ogbu, 1978, 2003). Research has revealed that mainstream teachers have lower expectations of Maori children and have failed to effectively identify or reflect on how their practice impacts on the educational experiences of Maori students. They also have had limited support to address these specific issues (Alton-Lee, 2003; Rubie-Davies, Hattie, & Hamilton, 2006). To boost academic performance, many researchers have called for methods of teaching and instruction that build on culture-based values and corresponding behaviours (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Macfarlane, 2004). More particularly, some believe that academic outcomes among Maori students can improve when classroom instructional activities are changed to reflect the behaviours and orientations considered salient in out-of-school contexts (Alton-Lee, 2003; Bevan-Brown, 2003; Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

John Ogbu (Ogbu, 1978; 2003) and Signithia Fordham (1996) are international scholars who suggest other reasons for the under-achievement of ethnic minority students. Both have argued that black students from all socio-economic backgrounds develop 'oppositional identities' that lead them to view schooling as a form of forced assimilation to white cultural values and come to equate academic success with 'acting white'. For minority students, such perceptions lead to the devaluation of academic pursuits and the adoption of self-defeating behaviours that inhibit possibilities for academic success.

Other international researchers in this area challenge Ogbu and Fordham's acting white thesis. Whilst carrying out research among high school students in Northern California, Noguera and Wing (2006) discovered that while some high-achieving minority students are ostracised by their peers, others learn how to succeed in both worlds by adopting multiple identities. They challenge racial stereotypes and seek to

redefine their racial identities by showing that it is possible to do well in school and be proud of who they are.

Claude Steele's (1997) work on the effects of racial stereotypes on academic performance also provides a compelling explanation for the identity-achievement paradox. Through his research on student attitudes toward testing, Steele found that students are highly susceptible to prevailing stereotypes related to intellectual ability. According to Steele, when 'stereotype threats' are operative, they lower the confidence of vulnerable students and negatively affect their performance on standardised tests. He also notes that the debilitating effects of stereotypes can extend beyond particular episodes of testing and can have an effect on a student's overall academic performance.

As much of the research illustrates, deeply embedded stereotypes that connect racial identity to academic ability, impact significantly on children's academic performance (Noguera & Wing, 2006). Children, especially children from ethnic minorities, become aware of these stereotypes as they grow up in the school context. Simply put, there are often strong assumptions made in New Zealand institutions that Pakeha do better in schools than Maori. These kinds of stereotypes affect both teachers' expectations of students and students' expectations of themselves.

Beyond these stereotypes, the sorting practices that go on in schools also send important messages to students about the meaning of ethnic categories. For example, in many schools students in the remedial classes are disproportionately Maori (Bevan-Brown, 2003; Macfarlane, 2004) and students often draw conclusions about the relationship between ethnic identity and academic ability based on these patterns. Children also notice that the students who are most likely to be punished, suspended and expelled are the Maori students. Nasir and Saxe's (2003) research has shown that "too often, minority students believe that they must choose between a positive ethnic identity and a strong academic identity" (p.13). Lee, Spencer and Harpalani (2003) state that this stems from a "lack of understanding of cultural pathways" and are concerned that people of predominantly European descent are the "normative population against which other groups are compared" (p.9).

Too often educators assume that because of the choices Maori students make about such things as whom to socialise with or which classes to take, they are anti-intellectual. However, the vast majority of Maori students express a strong desire to do well in school (Bishop, 2003). In fact, it has long been documented that school success is valued in Maori communities (Beaglehole & Beaglehole, 1946; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ihimaera, 1998). Maori students do not arrive at school with an anti-intellectual orientation. To the degree that such an orientation develops, it develops in school, from seeing under-achievement patterns and racial hierarchies as permanent. Because a great deal of this behaviour plays out in schools, I support the stance that educators can do something about it.

The hybrid experience in education

Ethnic identity can be considered a key factor in any individual's development. Whilst the models of ethnic/racial identity development developed by Cross (1978) and Phinney (1989) outlined in the identity chapter address the ethnic identity issues faced by all minority people, few have been able to adequately address the unique issues facing people of mixed descent (Herring, 1995; Poston, 1990).

In response to the lack of a model of hybrid identity development, Poston (1990) has presented the Biracial Development Model which adequately addresses the issues facing hybrid Maori/Pakeha in the education system. This model suggests that hybrid individuals develop through five stages: personal identity, choice of group categorisation, enmeshment/denial, appreciation, and integration. Participation in the education system is considered a key site where this development is likely to occur, in particular the choice of group characterisation stage.

Stage one, personal identity, is, according to Poston, characterized by one's identity being relatively inconsistent and dependent on self-esteem developed within the family. This is a critical developmental period for a child. Family members are instrumental in helping a hybrid child feel a sense of belonging and acceptance. The second stage, choice of group characterisation, usually occurs at school and may be a time of crisis for a child. During this stage the child is placed in a situation where they are compelled to select an ethnic identity and thus must choose between parents. The

third stage, enmeshment/denial, is characterised by confusion and guilt as a result of choosing an identity that may not be all-inclusive of one's dual ethnic heritage. This stage is characteristic of adolescence when group belonging becomes a central theme for all youth (Newman & Newman, 1999; Poston, 1990). The enmeshment/denial stage is even more difficult for biracial youth because they are struggling with dual-race membership. The fourth stage, appreciation, is a period during which the individual still identifies with one ethnic group but begins to broaden his or her understanding of multiple heritages. This is a time of exploration, resulting from the desire to know one's complete racial heritage. The final stage, integration, is characterized by the individual's ability to recognize and appreciate all of the ethnicities he or she possesses. At this point, the biracial individual feels complete and sees himself or herself as a contributing member of society.

Poston (1990) speculated that with support, biracial individuals can develop a healthy ethnic identity and achieve a sense of wholeness in their lives. However, ethnic identity development is a complex process for some hybrid Maori/Pakeha youth, especially as they enter adolescence. These adolescents may encounter conflicting values as they begin to ask, 'Who am I?' and 'Where do I belong?' (Newman & Newman, 1999). These youth may experience guilt and confusion about developing an identity that may not embody all aspects of their heritage (Herring, 1992). They may also be confronted with a lack of social acceptance due to prejudicial and stereotypical attitudes (Newman & Newman, 1999; Schwartz, 1998a). As a result, some hybrid youth can exhibit a variety of problems that have led researchers to label them 'at risk' (Kerwin, Ponterotto, Jackson, & Harris, 1993). These at-risk behaviours include (a) poor academic achievement, (b) off-task behaviour, (c) poor social skills, (d) negative attitudes toward adults, (e) chip-on-the shoulder personas, (f) social isolation, and (g) aggressive behaviours toward peers (McRoy & Freeman, 1986). More importantly, hybrid Maori/Pakeha youth may experience depression or exhibit maladaptive behaviours such as substance abuse, psychosomatic disorders and suicidal ideation (Herring, 1995; Poston, 1990). These behaviours may place the hybrid youth at risk of academic failure.

However, children of mixed descent who are socialised and knowledgeable usually benefit from their dual heritage (Noguera & Wing, 2006). Their families have an

opportunity to provide them with a cultural education that is broader than that of mono-ethnic children, giving them both opportunities for a larger knowledge base and a more informed sense of the world. They have an enhanced sense of self and identity and greater inter-group tolerance, language facility, appreciation of minority group cultures and ties to single-heritage groups than do mono-ethnic people (Thornton, 1996). In addition, they are able to identify multiple aspects of a situation (or both sides of a conflict) where other people see only one (Kerwin et al., 1993).

At the core of positive learning should be the learner's sense of belonging and the construction of a strong and positive ethnic identity. Belonging is about opening doors for students so that they can see themselves in the various communities within which they live and learn. This recognises the importance of the school environment in establishing the conditions in which the learner belongs and thus setting the conditions for interactions with others. Opportunities to learn should therefore enhance the learner's sense of belonging within the community, school and classroom.

Ethnic identity will continue to be a significant source of demarcation within our population. For many of us it will continue to shape where we live, play, go to school, and socialise. We cannot simply wish away the existence of ethnic identity and the associated racism, but we can take steps to lessen the ways in which the categories trap and confine us. Educators should be committed to helping students realise their intellectual potential as they make their way toward adulthood. They have a responsibility to help them find ways to expand their notions of ethnic identity and, in so doing, help them discover a sense of belonging.

Chapter 6

He mahi pono, he mahi tika

Methodology

This chapter outlines the research process and provides the reader with an overall picture of the way the investigation was conducted. I begin by outlining the purpose of the study and discussing the research paradigms that underpin the study. I then present a rationale for selecting a qualitative methodology and describe the research process of selecting the participants, the gathering and analysis of research data, and the presentation of the findings. Ethical considerations have also been addressed.

The purpose of the research

The current study was designed to explore the complexities involved in articulating an ethnic identity as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. Issues related to establishing a sense of belonging that tie a person to both ethnic groups are examined based on the life narratives of six people of dual Maori/Pakeha descent. This study aims to provide new insights and understandings about the challenges, issues and benefits associated with being of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Research Paradigms

This study is underpinned by critical theory because this paradigm has the potential to empower the research participants to transcend the constraints placed on them with regard to their race and ethnic identity. At the root of critical theory is a continual critique of ideology, assumptions and oppression. Critical theory rejects concepts of ‘naturalness’ and does not accept the social world as ‘given’, but instead challenges the assumed neutrality and objectivity of ‘facts’ (Lee, 1996). Critical theory asserts that these are socially constructed, determined and interpreted. Critical theory has been chosen as an underpinning framework because it seeks to “not only explain...problems, but to provide the means of resolving them by enabling people to gain more control over their own lives” (Gibson, 1986, p.1).

The theme of 'tino rangatiratanga' or 'self-determination' to question and overcome complexity regarding ethnic identity also underpins this study. It aims to question and examine all taken-for-granted assumptions and critiques the social and cultural structures, expectations and values placed on people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. By embracing critical theory, this study has identified and articulated the realities of the social world for some Maori/Pakeha. The process of critical theory has involved demystifying the inequalities and injustices experienced by people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent, through korero/discussion and understanding, to enable them to view their condition in a new light.

Central to critical theory and the ultimate purpose of this study are the concepts of transformation and emancipation (Freire, 1985; McLaren & Giarelli, 1995). Through an analysis of the power relations that influence the construction of ethnic identity, the research participants will become more aware of the factors that influence their ethnic identity development. Thus this study offers the participants a degree of autonomy and control regarding articulating ethnic identity as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. Unequal social relations can be transformed by exposing the structural, socio-cultural and psychological constraints that impact on ethnic identity formation, revealing ways in which relations of domination and subordination are maintained, located and revealed through analysis of culture, ethnicity and identity.

As the participants have the ability to construct and interpret knowledge and practices to maintain particular interests, so too can they recreate their worlds and become active participants in the struggle for emancipation. Critical theory provides us with the opportunity to engage and mediate the debilitating effects of the control of power by dominant groups and ideologies. It is through ideology that critical theory explores 'reality'.

Ideology as discussed by Simon (1982) is a distortion of reality which conceals the unequal power relations of the dominant class, makes its effects felt in all spheres of public and private life without too much effort and yet has a profound effect on practices, belief systems and public opinion (Apple, 1995, 2004). In the critical theory paradigm, all facts are socially constructed, humanly determined and interpreted and

hence subject to change (Gibson, 1986). In this study critical theory has been used to investigate the manifestations of taken-for-granted assumptions in lived experiences, challenge ethnic-based cultural perceptions and analyse the social processes involved in the development of ethnic identity.

Lastly, this study adopts methods that are couched within Kaupapa Maori theory and practice. The use of Kaupapa Maori research methodology is located in relation to critical theory with regard to the embedded notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation (Smith, 1997, 1999). Intervention and conscientisation are an integral part of this research methodology and the aim of this study is to promote and challenge the complexities that impact on ethnic identity formation. This study seeks to focus on the transformative potential of Kaupapa Maori methodology in reconceptualising ethnic identity and intervene in ideologies and practices that aim to define ethnic identity.

Kaupapa Maori methodology positions the researcher within Maori cultural and identity paradigms that accept '*Maori-ness*' as a given (Smith, 1999). Like critical theory, Kaupapa Maori is emancipatory in nature and challenges the unequal power relations and cultural expectations that are present in both Maori and Pakeha domains in New Zealand society today. Thus in this study Kaupapa Maori is a methodology of resistance to the social, educational and cultural based systems that operate to assimilate, control and define people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent.

Kaupapa Maori methodology challenges the raised status of Western knowledge systems and research methodologies and the exploitative nature of much research on Maori (Teariki & Spoonley, 1992). Kaupapa Maori also challenges the way in which the research undertaken often results in few positive outcomes for Maori and selectively and unfavourably compares Maori with non-Maori, thus resulting in deficit-based approaches to viewing Maori people (Bishop, 1996; Powick, 2003).

Kaupapa Maori methodology has shown itself as a radical, emancipatory, empowerment-oriented strategy and collaborative-based process, and when it is used systematically it can produce excellent research which can lead to improved policy, practice and individual outcomes for Maori people. It may be that Kaupapa Maori

methodology is not suitable for all research involving Maori. However, it does guarantee participants that they have substantial control over key tasks, for example, the interpretation and dissemination of findings (Walker, Eketone, & Gibbs, 2006).

Thus, Kaupapa Maori methodology is a flexible research strategy and many data-gathering methods could be applied within it; however, it does have clear philosophies, principles and practices, which must always be respected. Kaupapa Maori research must always be focused on enhancing the quality of life for Maori. As a research strategy it is related to Maori ownership of knowledge and acknowledging the validity of a Maori way of doing. Some commentators suggest it is unwise to try to define Kaupapa Maori research because it is both more and less than a paradigm, a form of resistance and agency, and a methodological strategy (Barnes, 2002; Bishop, 1996; Smith, 1999). At the heart of this study is the desire for the research to be by Maori, for Maori, using Maori cultural perspectives. Therefore Kaupapa Maori has been employed as a strategy for the empowerment and self-determination of the participants involved.

Qualitative Methodology

In undertaking this study and considering the research paradigms that underpin it, I chose to use a qualitative methodology. Qualitative research is concerned with trying to understand social life. It aims to build theory and is open and flexible in all aspects (Sarantakos, 2005). Qualitative research is embedded in the process of communication between the researcher and participant (Sarantakos, 2005). The role of the participants in this study is pivotal to its success as they are the subjects who define, explain, interpret and construct reality, and, as such, are as important as, if not more important than, the researcher (Sarantakos, 2005). The paradigms informing this methodology meant that the locus of control regarding the participants' involvement needed to be flexible. The participants were encouraged to be active rather than passive and to see themselves as critical not only to the product but also the process of the research. Their participation was not confined to the sharing of their stories, but involved a process whereby interaction and exchange of ideas could occur. Opportunities were made available for the participants to interpret their own

experiences rather than the researcher just gathering data to fit into a preordained paradigm or theory.

The key question guiding the research design was: *In what ways do people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent construct and articulate identities that reflect their dual heritage?* In line with Kaupapa Maori methodology and culturally preferred ways of transmitting knowledge, the method of narrative inquiry was used. Historically there have been strong preferences among Maori people for narrative (Bishop, 1996). Maori as an oral culture has used storying to pass on generations of whakapapa, traditions and history. It is also claimed that the use of narrative in educational research is important because humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and collectively, lead storied lives (Connelly, 1990). The narrative inquiry (Bishop, 1996), focused life story interview (Bertaux, 1981) or oral history interview method (Bryman, 2004) was employed in this study to empower the participants to explore their ethnic identity. This method is useful for a study of this kind as it encourages a reflective narrative to be produced at the participant's pace with the researcher listening and clarifying points of discussion. This also means a particular emphasis can be employed around a central topic, in this case Maori/Pakeha ethnic identity, so that the topic and valuable contextual influences on the topic can be discussed.

The narrative inquiry method allowed the participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural contexts and language (Bishop, 1996). The narrative structures and vocabularies that we use when we craft and tell our tales of our perceptions, are also, in themselves, significant, providing information about our social and cultural positioning. Differences in power, status and knowledge can make it difficult to achieve a level of open and mutual participation in a research interview. According to Bishop (1996), when undertaking research, "the traditional position of the researcher has been that of the storyteller, the narrator, the person that decides what constitutes the narrative" (p.23). Traditionally, the narratives are also often retold in a language and culture determined by the researcher.

In order to acknowledge my connectedness to the participants and the importance of their contribution to this research project I promoted commitment and engagement by recognising that they were not simply informants, but participants, with meaningful

experiences, concerns and questions (Connelly, 1990). Narrative inquiry allowed the participants to maintain the power to define what constituted their story and the truth and meaning it had for them. In this sense the traditional role of the researcher as interpreter is challenged (Smith, 1999).

Narrative inquiry was also used in this study to demonstrate how reflecting on stories of yesteryear can result in multiple learnings. This method illustrates the value of acknowledging experiences from the past and using them to understand the present and plan for the future. This study is about making sense of the perceptions of six people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent with regard to their perceived ethnic identity. It is as, Crotty (1998) states, looking at “culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of social life” (p.67).

Data Collection and Research Process

The Participants

Based on previous knowledge of the population and the specific purpose of the research, I decided to use personal judgement to select an initial sample that I believed would provide the data I needed - that is, people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. This purposeful sampling approach was used to select two participants who were information-rich. To elicit their involvement, I simply asked if they were prepared to talk about their ethnic identity as part of my research. After they accepted I asked if they could suggest other people who met the criteria and might be interested in participating in the research. The participants made the initial approach and if they expressed interest I then sent an email introducing myself and the project (appendix b), and arranged a time to meet and discuss the project in informal contexts - their homes or local cafes. This sampling technique can be referred to as snowball, chain or network sampling (Merriam, 1998).

I also wanted to maximise variation in the sample with regard to certain characteristics (Patton, 1990) including gender, occupation, participation in higher education and socio-economic status. In relation to the small number of research participants in this study, Merriam (1998) asserts that “the sample selection in

qualitative research is usually (but not always) random, purposeful, and small” (p.8). While it has satisfied my needs to use this type of sample, it does not pretend to represent the wider population and is deliberately and unashamedly selective and biased (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000).

Six participants were chosen and represented a diverse group of people of Maori/Pakeha descent. Each participant identifies as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent.

Matt is a post-graduate student

Nicola is a police officer

Hailey-Jane is a secondary teacher

Ramona is a company director

Khylee is a law lecturer

Brenda is a corporate investor

Participant self-report

A participant self-report (appendix c) was used to collect the same demographic information from all of the participants in the study. At the same time consent was sought (appendix a). The participant self-report sought baseline information from the participants regarding their name (or pseudonym if preferred), occupation and preferred ethnic label. This information was analysed for the purpose of making clear to the reader the participant group composition and initial perspectives regarding ethnic identity.

Semi-structured interviews

Interviews are suitable for eliciting views and opinions from participants and allow the interviewer to probe the interviewee for clarification or further information. This study used the semi-structured or guided interview approach (Creswell, 2003). While the interview schedule (appendix d) was developed prior to the interviews, the schedule was often departed from when opportunities for clarification and elaboration arose during the interview process. The semi-structured interview format was useful

to draw on as the pre-planned questions ensured the participants' responses were focused on similar experiences; however, when it was necessary for participants to clarify an answer or elaborate on an idea, the flexibility of the semi-structured approach allowed for questions that would garner this information. Furthermore, on occasions where participants' responses opened up previously un-thought of, yet relevant areas of inquiry, it became possible to pursue these ideas.

Semi-structured narrative inquiry interviews took place which were based on prepared questions designed to be unambiguous (appendix d). Potential bias was reduced because of these consistent questions. The questions were based on the participants' responses to the initial participant self-report. The interview process allowed the researcher to document the experiences of the individuals - how they interpreted, understood and defined their worlds with regard to belonging to two ethnic groups. It also allowed the voices of a historically-marginalized group to be heard in an academic educational forum. The interviews encouraged the participants to reflect upon specific events and periods in their lives where their dual heritage impacted on their ethnic identity. This information was used to compose retrospective stories of Maori/Pakeha experiences, presented in their own words and on their own terms. This is in line with Atkinson's (1998) view that a life story is the story a person chooses to tell about the life he or she has lived. It is told as completely and honestly as possible - what is remembered of it and what the teller wants others to know of it - usually as the result of a guided interview of another.

In preparing to question the participants, I explained the following: "I am interested in exploring your dual identity. I would like you to think about what it means to be a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent? Which ethnic group do you identify with more strongly and why? To answer these questions, I would like you to tell me about significant experiences, people, relationships and events that have shaped your understanding of your ethnic identity". If the participants asked for clarification, I prompted discussion with questions such as:

- Your answer in the participant self-report indicates that you self-identify as a member of the _____ ethnic group. Please explain why you choose this group?

- In your view, what are the key expectations for a member/s of this/these ethnic group/s? (behaviours, cultural processes, language)
- What specific life experiences have contributed to this perspective? (Consider whanau experiences, values and expectations, school and work environments, media, iwi/hapu obligations)
- Are there any whanau, friends or others that have influenced your sense of identity? Can you explain their influence?
- At what stage in your life could you confidently state your ethnic identity? Please explain.
- Is your ethnic identity an important factor/influence in your life at present? (E.g. job, family practices, hobbies, education). Please explain.
- What are the complexities/challenges/rewards of being a member of this ethnic group?

Rather than asking each participant the same questions in the same order, questioning was contingent upon story content and the flow of the interview. This meant that some participants were asked the majority of the questions directly, while others made many questions irrelevant by addressing them without being asked. This allowed the discussion to be fluid and dynamic, while allowing me to collect similar types of information from each participant.

The task of the researcher during the interview was to facilitate the flow of narration whilst interrupting occasionally to ask for further clarification on certain points. Providing some guidance to interviewees in the form of questions posed at the appropriate time, ensured the participants remained focused on the topic under study and can be seen as one way of eliciting comparable information from different participants (McAdams, 1994). Patton (1990) referred to this style of semi-structured interview as the “standardised open-ended interview” (p.197) and argues that it allows the discovery of unexpected material in personal accounts while ensuring cases were consistent and therefore amenable to comparison. In addition, this approach enabled me to ask specific questions about the significant experiences and key relationships that shaped their ethnic identity. Another benefit of the semi-structured format was that it allowed me to compare answers to the questions asked of each interviewee and to follow up on topics of interest initiated by the interviewees

themselves. This enabled me to fine tune my focus on emerging issues of importance when needed and to achieve greater depth of understanding of the process of identity development among people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent.

Focus Groups

According to Sarantakos (2005) the basic assumption that underlies a focus group discussion is that a group environment will, through mutual discussion: encourage discussion related to the key issue – ethnic identity; increase the motivation to address social and critical issues; enable the researcher to lead and participate in the discussion through encouragement; and allow significant points of view to be presented in a real, emotional and summated form as spontaneous expressions (in other words reducing the opportunity for a controlled presentation of personal views) (Sarantakos, 2005). Anastas (1999) states that focus groups are effective in that they elicit and elucidate differing feelings and opinions around particular topics. In addition, the technique is practical because data can be collected quickly and easily.

The six participants were invited to an informal interview in a group discussion setting. In a focus group, a number of people who share specific characteristics of interest to the researcher are assembled and questions are posed to the group to elicit their reactions (Anastas, 1999). The focus group method was employed in this research in an attempt to collect information and allow the participants to share and question each other's understandings of ethnic identity and what it means to be a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent.

The process of meeting in a group forum to collect information may be likened to a hui. This Maori term simply refers to a gathering or assembly of people who come together for a particular purpose and is a customary method of information sharing in Maori communities (Barlow, 1991; Bishop, 1996). The protocol of the hui used in this study was determined by two factors. Firstly, tikanga Maori dictated that I needed to introduce myself to the group, openly discuss my reasons for calling the hui and then allow them to address the kaupapa (topic) and ask questions in their own time and manner. Secondly, I wished to provide a safe and supportive cultural context for the sensitive discussions to occur, so we started with karakia (prayer) and a waiata

(song) and ended with kai (food). These simple practices lifted the tapu (sacredness) of the hui and were a culturally correct way to restore relationships and indicate an end to the discussion (Mead, 2003).

After gaining ethical consent, the participants were selected and sent the participant self-report to complete. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with individual participants and then a focus group discussion occurred.

‘Tika’ – a culturally relevant research process

In line with Kaupapa Maori methodology and key to the data collection process was the emphasis placed on making the research procedures culturally relevant and as enjoyable as possible for the participants. This included meeting prior to the interviews for a general korero and ‘get to know each other’ discussion. This allowed the research process to proceed with the participants feeling that they could trust me to involve them in as many aspects of the process as possible. Coupled with this was an intense commitment to keeping the research and data collection processes as flexible as possible to meet the needs and wishes of the participants. This often meant that interviews took place after food was consumed (provided by both the researcher and participants) and were conducted in venues chosen by the participants, occurred in weekends and after work hours and involved participants sleeping at my house when travel was involved. Participants were able to bring whanau or friends along to tautoko them if they wished.

All interviews began with a detailed explanation of the study. When describing the project, I was careful to consider the preconceived ideas and indicators of Maori culture that might arise from participants being told that this was a study about Maori/Pakeha identity. The study was described as a way of having a conversation and gathering information about what their lives were like as people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent in New Zealand. Participants were informed that this research was about all the ways people might be Maori, Maori/Pakeha or Pakeha (depending on how they identified themselves), some of which might relate to common indicators and some of which might be new or different. The interview topics covered subjects like whanau, school, community, friends, occupation, media and sport. The aim of

this approach was to elicit a range of comments on what things participants felt were important with respect to their ethnic identity, rather than a measurement of conventional indicators (Durie, 1995; Karetu, 1990; Kukutai, 2004). This approach was useful because it enabled me to recognise the wider environmental and contextual influences within which ethnic identity is constituted.

Data Analysis

In his examination of analytic methods for qualitative data, Potter (1996) noted that there is no one ideal method of data analysis in qualitative research. He, instead, suggests that, as each research project is unique, the researcher should construct a procedure that allows him or her to extract the most insightful meaning from the evidence collected.

To analyse the data for this research project I chose an approach underpinned by the principles of grounded theory. Grounded theory (Creswell, 2003; Strauss & Corbin, 1990) involves the development of a conceptual framework that is emergent rather than firmly predetermined. Rather than being a formulation of some pre-existing reality out there, grounded theory is a cognitive construction based on a particular data set (Dey, 1993). Sarantakos (1998) suggests that grounded theory-based approaches to data analysis is a suitable approach to data analysis when the researcher is primarily concerned with the thinking that emerges from a limited amount of data. Therefore, in this study I have attempted to derive a general theory grounded in the views and experiences of the participants.

This approach involved using multiple stages of data collection and the refinement and inter-relationship of categories of information (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In general, *data analysis* means a search for patterns in data – recurrent behaviours, objects or a body of knowledge. Once a pattern is identified, it is interpreted in terms of social theory or the setting in which it occurred. The qualitative researcher moves from the description of a historical event or social setting to a more general interpretation of meaning (Neuman, 1997).

The data was coded using an iterative approach similar to grounded theory which Strauss & Corbin (1990) call the *constant comparative method*. As in grounded theory, I have continuously ‘cycled’ through the data, making comparisons between the data and the derived categories until the core ideas were verified (Creswell, 2003). Due to the narrative nature of this study, alongside collecting the individual stories from the participants, I have had to return to fill in the gaps in their stories. This occurred before and during my analysis of their stories.

I also initially coded the data into rationally derived domains (topic areas) and then abstracted the core ideas (the ‘essence’ of what people said) in each domain (Creswell, 2003). In contrast, a grounded theory researcher would usually code the meanings or themes directly in the transcript and then put the meanings (core ideas) in a hierarchical structure (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The findings of my research were subsequently summarised into two main themes. I was then able to describe and discuss the general findings across the pool of participants. Two clear themes emerged from an analysis of the participants’ narratives. The factors that had the most significant impact on the participants’ ethnic identity development were their experiences with a) exclusion and inclusion and b) negotiating and eventually self-defining their ethnic identity. These two themes are discussed in chapter eight.

The trustworthiness of the study

Validity in social science is more often associated with quantitative research and there is considerable debate within the research community regarding validity in qualitative research (Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998). Proponents of quantitative research often question the validity of results in qualitative research and suggest a lack of legitimacy (Bryman, 2004). However, qualitative researchers have taken a range of stances on validity ranging from little change in the meaning of criteria to the use of different criteria in evaluating studies. Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose the use of the notion of trustworthiness as an alternative to validity.

Marshall and Rossman (2006) state that “all research must respond to canons of quality – criteria against which the trustworthiness of the project can be evaluated” (p.191). Four canons of quality were used to establish the truthfulness, credibility or

believability of this study's findings (Neuman, 2003). Firstly, Merriam (1998) suggests that triangulation should be achieved through "using multiple investigators, multiple sources of data, or multiple methods to confirm findings" (p.204). Similarly, Cohen et al (2000) discuss how threats to validity and reliability can be minimised in social science research through the use of two or more methods of data collection. In this study, multiple sources of data were gained through the participant self-report, semi-structured interview and focus group discussion. Secondly, Merriam argues that validity or trustworthiness can be achieved through member checks by taking the data back to the participants. All participants used opportunities to verify their transcribed interviews and individual narratives. Thirdly, Merriam suggests that researchers should make their findings available to peers and colleagues for feedback. This was achieved in this study through regular meetings with my supervisors, conference presentations on the study and publication of the preliminary findings in a refereed journal. Finally, Merriam prompts researchers to clearly reveal their biases, assumptions, worldviews and theoretical orientation. In this study, every attempt has been made to make explicit my position.

Researcher bias is one of the most persistent charges against the trustworthiness of qualitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Where strong personal interest is seen to drive the research, the challenge is for the researcher to demonstrate that bias is reduced as much as possible (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Researcher bias can be seen to distort and unduly influence the faithful representation of data and the subsequent interpretations. Most commonly, researcher bias is seen as a deviation from validity and therefore something to be avoided (Hammersley, 1993). A strategy used in this study to limit researcher bias was regular debriefings with my academic supervisors who challenged my interpretations and thinking. The other and most important strategy was to check for bias via participant verification of the narratives and subsequent data analysis (Merriam, 1998; Neuman, 2003). Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that participant verification "is a crucial technique for establishing credibility" (p.314). This process was seen as vital to the research.

Lastly, it is believed that narrative inquiry interviews were a valid and appropriate methodological choice because they enabled the collection of rich, in-depth, personal interpretations of ethnic identity not easily accessed using quantitative techniques. In

addition, it is a culturally appropriate methodology to employ with Maori participants for several reasons. One, as noted by Bishop (1996) is that there is a strong preference in traditional Maori society for the use of oral story-telling to pass on knowledge. In addition, this approach works from the premise that identity should be explored from the participants' perspective and thus is considered by advocates (Bishop, 1996; Borrell, 2005) as an empowering Kaupapa Maori research methodology. The approach gave the Maori participants a chance to have their voices and perspectives written, acknowledged and legitimised. Bishop (1996) believes that life story or narrative inquiry:

“addresses Maori concerns in a holistic, culturally-appropriate manner, because story-telling allows the participant to select, recollect and reflect upon their stories within their own cultural context and language, rather than the cultural context and language chosen by the researcher”.

(p.24)

The validity of narrative inquiry factual data has been challenged. Baumeister (1991), for example, argued that the participant retellings are a product of selective memory and, as such, we must be sceptical of the authenticity of people's accounts of their own past. Similarly, Burr (1995) commented upon the fallibility of recollections of personal past observing that, as they are constructed from memory, they share memories' incomplete nature. McAdams (1994) added to this by stating that an individual's memories may be distorted in order to maintain consistency with the individual's currently held views. This is termed 'retrospective bias' (Baumeister, 1991). To argue for the validity of the narrative inquiry method in this study, I emphasise that the aim of this research was to explore the mixed Maori/Pakeha individual's own interpretation of identity and not to collect factually precise historical data. As such, it was not deemed necessary to try to verify the precise accuracy of each participant's account.

Another consideration with regard to reliability was the potential influence of social desirability – that is, whether participants in this study offered narratives which they believed were socially-acceptable in the context in which they were recounted. McAdams (1994) observed that participant narratives should be seen as selected

renditions of the individual's history – heavily influenced by the demand characteristics of the situation such as the individual's perception of their role in the interview process and their perceptions of the interviewer. Participant narratives vary according to whom they are told, with interviewees playing up or down elements they believe desirable, depending upon their audience (Burr, 1995). Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) observe that in order to minimise social desirability, researchers should show no favour or disfavour with the content of responses during interviews so as not to influence the behaviour of interviewees. However, Lindlof (1991) pointed out that some degree of active intervention by the researcher is needed to promote adequate interview flow. In an effort to minimise social desirability I opted to establish rapport and affiliation with the participants (by showing genuine concern and interest in their experiences) but avoided taking sides or evaluating their interview content (as good or bad) during the course of the interview.

Therefore, it is asserted that the findings of this study are a trustworthy representation of the participants' perspectives regarding their dual ethnic identity. This study provides the reader with a credible and coherent exploration of the factors that impact on ethnic identity development for six people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent.

The next chapter presents the six participants' stories.

Chapter 6

Pakiwaitara

The participants' stories

Ramona's Story

I identify myself in relation to those who have had the greatest influence in my life - those who have shaped my values and ideals, including my whanau and most significantly my mother. My mother Lena is from Torere (on the East Coast). My grandmother Sarah Maxwell Waihi was born Ngati Porou and raised by her Ngai Tai grandparents under her Herewini and Maxwell whanau. My grandfather Tom Richmond was born and raised in Torere also. His parents were Eru Rihimona (Ngai Tai, Tainui) and Rahera Rewita (Whakatohea, Ngai Tama hapu). I was raised by my mother and grandparents. These three key people, along with my aunties and uncles, cousins and whanau, formulated my daily life and really are the foundation of my identity, of who I am. Knowing this helps me to feel like I can achieve and defines what I'm about. They have helped me to understand the value of whanau and therefore, being Maori.

I was brought up by my mother because my father Joseph Radford died in Vietnam when I was only three. I'm not sure if my life would've been different had he lived. My father's family did not acknowledge us. I've always believed it was because we were Maori. However, I lived a happy and healthy childhood because of my extended whanau's commitment in helping my mother to bring us up.

It wasn't until I began school at the age of 5 that I was taught the connection between who I was with my whanau and what others called being a 'Maori'. I didn't even know that I was 'Maori'. I knew that I belonged to this big group of people who were my aunties, uncles, grandparents, mother and brother, but I didn't realize that that was 'Maori'. I found out that I was Maori at school because that's what they told me I was. When we talked as whanau, we didn't actually refer to ourselves as "Maori". We just called ourselves "whanau". I had lived in a rural community for all those years

but I didn't make the connection between myself and this large group of people called 'Maori'.

In terms of expectations for Maori we were expected to look after each other. Whanau came first. If anyone had a need then it was filled by us as a whanau and that perhaps is something that I carry today. I've come to understand that what we have belongs not to us, but the whanau, and its there for us to share. I also understand that there is much that I am expected to do that is specific to a Maori tikanga context, marae protocol, kawa and the like. Words like te reo and Kaupapa Maori are modern words to me. They are terms I heard only after the 1980's and after my friends had attended university and learnt their tikanga and te reo there.

There is much that I think and do just because it was taught and has always been expected of me by my whanau as far back as I can remember – stuff that I know I should do no matter where I am, what I'm doing or who I'm with. Such things include the sharing of food with others, always; the idea that older persons and the children and babies are to be served ahead of the others and are to receive the best of whatever is available; the expectation to be obedient to my elders without question; a reverence for the body and the connection of man to the earth mother Papatuanuku; the spiritual perspective to life; the paramount value of whanau in an otherwise materialistic world; the understanding that nothing can be owned by me, that I am merely a guardian, a steward of everything entrusted to me; the idea of respect, integrity, modesty and humility in human relationships; and the expectation to contribute, to work and to give back. To be honest, these are the things that I judge the 'Maori-ness' of myself and others on and they are the values I choose to pass on to my own children.

I understood Maori fluently as a child although English was my first language. It was spoken around me most of the time in the years between the age of three and six and through to my teen years by my family. My grandmother would only speak one or two words of English at a time and I had to know because all instructions at my grandparents home were given out in Maori and obedience was essential. In our own home, however, English was spoken and Maori occasionally.

I knew my mother did not want us to speak Maori. We knew that Maori was valued only in Maori society and outside of that society speaking Maori was frowned upon and that it would get you nowhere. She was protecting us from the society that had gone to lengths to prohibit her and her schoolmates from speaking their first language at school. I remember in school we (meaning all Maori children) would be fearful to pronounce Maori words correctly in case we were singled out from everyone else. I couldn't say the word Whakatane (pronounced correctly) because it sounded like a swear word. At school we'd say Wakatane (pronounced incorrectly).

Once in High School the tables turned and Maori were the majority as the Tuhoe kids from Ruatoki and Taneatua were bused into town. Maori was spoken freely and fluently around the school. However, by this stage I'd lost the language. A couple of years ago I described to a friend what it felt like to have lost the language. I told her that it was as close to grief as any other experience of loss that I had ever felt. I felt as though something which was mine had been taken from me and it had left a hole that could not be filled.

Going to school in an urban setting was another stage in my life where I was challenged to view my place in the world as a Maori. In Torere my younger brother and I attended a settlement school that was on land gifted to the school by my great grandfather Eru. The teachers were aunties and the kids were my cousins. We saw each other everyday even when not at school. We'd meet at the marae or on the beach at the urupa or at each other's houses. In Whakatane things were completely different. We lived in a house and no one else came and went as part of our family, not the way we'd been used to. Because I was distinctly Pakeha-looking with blue eyes, blonde hair and fair skin, I was treated differently from my brother by my mother who was again, trying to protect me, and by others. Mum would keep me at home most of the time and restrict my friends to other Maori girls who had at least one parent of European descent.

I would also get mixed reactions depending on who I was with. If I was playing with Maori children I would be singled out and taunted as 'half-caste' or 'half-breed' by the Pakeha kids. Looking back they didn't seem to pick on the Maori kids; I think

they didn't dare try. Often, however, I would be left alone and called a snob. I recall as a 7-year-old my blonde hair would be pulled often. Somehow I convinced my mother to cut my hair so I didn't have long hair to pull. The only other difference I recall in the classroom was being separated out and classed as Maori when it came to health checks.

At home my mother would keep us separate from certain others in the neighbourhood. We learned there were *types* of Maori. We associated with some and we were instructed to stay away from others because they were different from us and would lead us into trouble. They spoke differently, behaved differently and thought differently. I remember knowing it was easy to tell which children and houses my mother would object to me being around; they were generally darker and their houses looked different from ours. I also remember being told many times to speak 'proper English' although I thought it was more interesting to speak English with the up and down, emphasis-on-the-last-vowel street dialect common around the neighbourhood. I'd be slapped and told not to talk like a 'Hori' if ever I forgot myself in front of my mother.

When I left home to go to a faith-based boarding school I recall a feeling of freedom came over me as far as my ethnicity was concerned. A great majority of the kids here were Maori or part-Maori too but no one else seemed to have anything to prove with regards to it. In this domain the Church teachings and schoolwork were the focus and there were no ethnic expectations one way or the other; I didn't feel I had to behave in any particular way as far as being Maori was concerned. I was able to relax and be whom I chose to be. However, I became disconnected emotionally from my hometown and from our way of life. Though I continued to observe the values and expectations of Maori culture, I have to say that at this point in my life my cultural identity became less important until I had my firstborn son.

His birth ignited a new interest in the values taught me by my whanau as a young child. The father of my son was Maori and I knew that I'd chosen him because of this fact. Since this time, my identity has been cemented together by the memories and teachings of my tipuna and by my hope for a good future for my children. My wish is

that my sons be clear about who they are sooner than I was. Because of this I choose to define myself as Maori.

Good friends who identify as Maori-European have helped shape my identity because I can share frustrations with them. We talk about our difficulties. Most recently there has been a whole lot of negative media about Maori (in fact right through my life) but as an adult I have found that I can talk about that and that I can talk about what it means to me or what I could do about it. Up until that point I really didn't feel that I could have an opinion or offer an opinion or be involved either way; my opinion wasn't valid because no-one considered me Maori. But finding that I could talk with others who have had the same experiences as me kind of gave me permission to become involved, participate and contribute. When I saw that they had the confidence to become involved, it gave me more confidence.

Five years ago I was attending Waikato University and doing a degree in Social Science. I had a Maori paper called 'Maori and Pakeha in Contemporary New Zealand'. It was all about identity confusion. I was really embarking at that stage on a journey of self-discovery. I was looking for education (to provide a future for myself) and also looking at my personal identity. This paper talked a lot about what the key markers of Maori were. It talked about 'te reo' and 'tikanga' and 'Kaupapa Maori' and Maori myths and legends. Basically the lecturer was saying that he considered Maori-ness to be very connected to the 'reo' and a lot of the research underpinned his opinion. I had a lot that I could contribute to our people back home and I took offence because I don't speak te reo and had been kept from it. But I knew what it was to be involved in a Maori community. I knew what it was to be a part of your marae and to be involved physically in the activities of my community and marae and to have the heart. But the paper had negated all of this. As an assignment I had to write what I thought the identifying characteristics of a Maori were. I wrote that it was all about the heart, what we feel. I got a C- (laughs) for the assignment and when I went to see the lecturer about it he said that 'the research shows that this is not true' and I said 'I don't care what the research says, I am Maori and I identify as Maori. I don't speak te reo but I do have a heart for it'. He failed me and subsequently I dropped out. However, I defiantly felt at that point that I could confidently state that I was Maori. I

had to listen to my tupuna and whakapapa. Nobody was going to tell me what it was to be a Maori because that was for me to decide and my whanau.

I used to find it sad that my Maori-ness was not acceptable to many Maori. I didn't understand why my own people would deny me my birthright. Now I find it ignorant and it amuses me that some appoint themselves as gatekeepers of my heritage and the heritage of others like me without the authority to do so. Even now I have never received a Maori grant or scholarship though I've applied for more than five – I choose to keep applying and using my very English name. And though I get hassled on Treaty issues and cultural politics in the work place and tick the “Maori” box on every application form I fill in, I am still criticized by some because I don't introduce myself in Maori. I own who I am and who I have determined myself to be. I am comfortable with this. I felt quite empowered by the fact that I've chosen to identify myself as Maori. I wasn't waiting for someone to tell me you're not Maori because you have got blue eyes and fair skin. I no longer care to know what anyone else thinks on the subject.

Identifying as Maori is important for my son. As a mother I feel that its very important to have my son involved, to learn as much as possible about the way that I was brought up. I feel a little bit disconnected from some Maori issues because sometimes I don't understand where some groups are coming from. I choose to look at each situation for what it is about rather than whether it is labelled a Maori issue or not – because who says so? Maybe the same people who say I'm not. So what do they know? My son has been taught to be proud of being Maori; he is quite happy about stating that word. He goes to a European school, but has been involved on committee and is a Maori representative. He is comfortable with that and is in the kapahaka group. I decided that when my son was born I would give him his father's surname. It's a Maori name. Really, it was as a statement to myself and to my mother. He is what he is and he should be proud of that. Now looking back I'm really glad that I did that. I'm also a bit sad that I had to think about it.

I should acknowledge my Pakeha heritage ... or study into my other heritage. I said to my brother that we should plan a trip to go to England and have a look around and go

and visit families who are there. I do know my family history back nine generations on my father's side but the feeling is different.

The benefit and the reward of being Maori is that I have a connection to the whenua especially down home. That's the place that I can call home, that I can go to and feel comfortable. Everybody knows me and I don't need to be anything. I feel that that's the place where I can always take my children and that we can belong to; I can be buried there and my family will always be found there. That is something particular to Maori. We do not see ourselves as 'one' or 'alone'. We are part of a whole whanau.

I feel one of the main challenges for me is that I live in Auckland, where I'm getting an education and good opportunities. But my heart (my wairua) is back home with my whanau, my iwi. Eventually that's where I know I need to go, because that's where I will have completeness. And so the complexity for me is that I am not quite complete here. Although I'm happy and life is good up here, I don't feel any support and I don't feel I'm needed as much as I do down there.

Nicola's Story

I identify as Maori/Pakeha because I don't feel that I'm qualified to say that I'm specifically Maori. I don't feel I'm able to say that I'm Maori because I feel that people will just say, "what?" But because I know that I'm Maori and love being Maori, I don't feel comfortable saying that I'm Pakeha. I guess my problem lies in the way I look. That 'Maori' package doesn't fit me. I don't fit into that stereotypical Maori mould.

There's definitely a way of talking and a way of existing, especially in Rotorua. Even in saying that, everyone in Rotorua (pronounced correctly) used to say 'Row-tow-ru-wa'. Maybe it's a new thing but if you want to identify as Maori now you say *Rotorua* (pronounced correctly). It's just the way you talk. A bit of 'bro-talk' is expected too, which I just refuse to do. The way you behave, the way you are dressed, the way you look affects others' perceptions of your 'Maori-ness'. In my personal experience, if you dress in a certain way (dress up) you are pretending to be Pakeha, a fathead - whakahihi. I guess the job, being a police officer, doesn't help. It's not a very *Maori* job.

At work I think my dual heritage is a bit of a novelty actually. I'm palatable, the way I look. My colleagues know that I'm Maori but that is because the job has bracketed me as being Maori. Those who don't know look at me and think, "she's not". They think they can get away with more, like they're not scared around me about political correctness and things Maori. They would be around someone who is *obviously* Maori or someone who they thought was tuturu Maori. I don't confront all their built up beliefs of how Maori are. I don't think they would worry about talking about land issues in front of me because I look like them basically – Pakeha.

When I first joined the police I was almost forced into making an announcement that I was Maori. I saw and heard things I wasn't happy with - racial slurs directed at Maori. I didn't like that so I put my hand up straight away to say that I'm Maori. That's probably the first time that I've said I'm Maori and I'm not going to tolerate this. Some mustn't know that I am Maori because sometimes when we sit at the table you can hear where the conversation is going, you know it because you've heard it for

years. You can hear where it's going and you'll watch the cop who's saying it. He looks around the table and susses out if it is ok, "yeah I'm amongst friends, no enemies here because we are all fair-skinned". Then they will come out with it and it's because they thought that I was one of them.

When growing up in Ngongotaha, I didn't even understand that there was a Maori/Pakeha 'thing' and if I did, it was just words. I didn't understand all that came with being Maori/Pakeha. It was quite an integrated school; I couldn't even tell you the statistics and figures but I would say that there was just as many Maori as there were Pakeha. We had a very staunch, strong kapahaka group or 'Maori club' as it was back then. There were many blond-haired, blue-eyed people.

But through high school, if I look back, all my friends were Maori and that probably came through playing sport and growing up in Ngongotaha. The street that we lived in was all solo mums and a low socio-economic area. I didn't even know that we were a solo mum family. I can't think of any specific things, but I just always thought that I was Maori and I was part of that group. I thought everyone thought that I was Maori too. It just became accepted that I was Maori. People knew my family too and Steven is really obviously Maori and Paul is probably less Maori-looking than me. It was who we were friends with. By association, we became more Maori. In some ways I was probably more Maori at school just because I grew up with all those people out in Ngongotaha. Basically I was Maori just like them. It hasn't been till recently that I felt that I wasn't the same as them.

Although my dad is the Maori one he didn't influence my sense of identity much. He's not very Maori, although he's obviously Maori to look at. I don't begrudge him any of that, because that's to do with his generation - where he fell in the family. Dad's more proud to be Maori now than he was back then. He was the youngest boy and all the other boys were sent off to Te Aute College and it was decided that dad wasn't going. He was going to stay on the farm and work the land with his dad. For my dad, who was a proud man, it just wasn't an option. So he ran away and joined the Navy and he never looked back.

Dad's *success* was marrying my mum who was Pakeha and bringing her back to Whakaki and saying, "this is my Pakeha wife". I don't believe he introduced her by name. Mum's got these fantastic stories of going down to our marae and dad shouting at the top of his voice, "me and my **Pakeha** wife can not sleep here. We have to sleep at the homestead". Only my Nan and Koro, the chosen elite, got to sleep at the homestead. But because dad had secured a Pakeha wife, he thought that he was now worthy to go down there. But that was of the time. He thought that being Maori wasn't going to get him anywhere, and good for him, he went off and saw the world and moved away.

He would come back and take us down there and I knew I had a Koro and aunties and stuff, but back in those days it seemed they didn't notice that they were Maori. Nothing was verbalised; it was just the way things were done. People didn't say, "this is how Maori do things". It was just the way things were. I still wasn't aware that I was going down to my *Maori* family.

I remember going to my pa's tangi. I was about 14 by then or 15 and my mum packed my bag and packed my red leather skirt with the red leather bodice with the plunging V-neck to wear to the tangi. Who knew that it wasn't appropriate? We didn't know and my mum didn't know. How could she know? It was well-received by my cousins though. They bragged to everyone, "here comes my Pakeha cousin; she's from America" (laughs).

My involvement in sport has been helpful. The basis of my friendships was pretty much around sport. That became basically the core of our life, so all the social activities and boyfriends and stuff all came as a result of sport. I guess me being good at sport was a natural acceptance that I was Maori. There was always that korero about some girl playing for another team, "you know, the Pakeha one" - like it was a rarity to have a person who was in a top-side who was also Pakeha. We always wanted to beat Taranaki because they were a Pakeha team. I always used to throw these terms around loosely myself, "those Pakeha girls", not thinking for a minute that some people were looking at me going, "that Pakeha girl".

To be honest I don't remember ever thinking that I was a *fair Maori*. I think I thought I was black as eh, that I was as Maori as they come. I thought I was the same as Lisa and Alice and we are because we've both got one Maori parent and one Pakeha parent. But for some reason they were always more Maori. The difference for me I guess was I was brought up with my Pakeha mum and the Maori aspect of our life was gone. We went to our Pakeha grandparents who lived on a farm and had two cars, which was "well off". We were poor, dirt poor, probably poorer than the Maori family across the road.

Actually a very Maori part of my family is that my Pakeha mum is very accepting; whatever you did she was going to accept it. If I decided I wanted to work at Pak n' Save full-time, mum will always say, "oh, you got a job – excellent". Or if I just became a doctor she'd say, "oh, excellent". So it's always going to be accepted and the level of love or level of support wasn't going to change depending of what you did.

I'm concerned with the way people just throw away the words, 'I'm Maori'. There is never any discussion about things past those empty words basically. Those words have become something bigger for me, more knowledge-based now. There is much more whakaaro behind my intrinsic belief that I'm Maori.

Being Maori is an important part of my life, probably more so than ever. I'm working in Rotorua, which means working with more Maori. Our clientele are mainly Maori. My boyfriend's Maori. My brother's in a group where his friends are all quite staunch Maori and my best friends from there are Maori. So yeah a lot of things that I'm doing and a lot of contacts I have are Maori-based. The last couple of years there has been a lot of political stuff around things Maori. That has being quite exciting. Its quite negative stuff, but it does make you read a lot more and you get passionate. It stirs emotions that you haven't felt before. My Pakeha grandfather loves to see me come in the door because he might have just seen an article in the news about the foreshore and he'll say, "oh here's one of them now". Then he cleverly, at 80 years of age, words a conversation around the foreshore and leads me into a quick argument which always ends in me walking out the door.

The benefit for me is that I can walk in both worlds. I know that I can fit in at a Pakeha gig. I know the behaviours and how to act accordingly - to be accepted and to fit in and be well-received. I know how to appeal to those people, warm their hearts, and chuck in a couple of little cute, quaint Maori things so they think, “wow, she is a Maori”. In doing that, it breaks down barriers. Regardless of the way that other people feel about it, maybe they will say, “we shouldn’t have to do that.” Maybe we shouldn’t have to do it but anything that’s going to break down the barrier and open people’s eyes to other cultures has got to be a good thing.

I think the complexity is that I consider myself to be quite Maori and a lot of doors in the Maori world get shut to me. It’s just a matter of me saying, “hey...I’m Maori”, but sometimes I feel a bit whakama about going, “hang on, hang on, I’m Maori. I want to be doing this with you”. For example, on marae, we’ll be going around a group of obviously Maori people, doing the hongi. They’ll come to me and say, “thanks for coming dear”. To everyone else there’s been a “Kia ora” and hongi, while I’ll get a kiss on the cheek. Then I’ll go and help out in the kitchen, even on my own marae and they’ll say, “oh, no dear, you go and sit down”. That type of thing has ostracised me from a lot of my cousins. I’m a bit of a ‘pa-princess’ of sorts. Not that I have a choice. I would much rather spend time in the kitchen with the kids hanging out, rather than sitting with all the old kuia and listening to adult talk.

A lot of times now when I’m dealing with Maori families, they often, when I go to domestics and things, just close the door to me straight away because I’m not obviously Maori. But I wouldn’t change it I don’t think. I wouldn’t want to be any darker. I know that Sha, who I work with is always dealt with as a Maori and she doesn’t have the luxury that I do - being able to be seen as both.

Matt's Story

I choose to identify as Maori not necessarily because of whakapapa but because I feel that's what I am. It has been a lifelong process of accepting; being able to accept it for me is empowering. For me Maori was the opposite of being Pakeha when I was young. I aspired to be that, the other group, because I was told to forget about being Maori. So I thought that the only other option was to be Pakeha, so I aspired to be that. Pakeha was just another version of Maori. It sounds weird, but I aspired to be Pakeha. When I was young I didn't know of any Pakeha whakapapa or anything. I just thought it was a grouping of misplaced Maori - Maori who weren't so Maori but still looked Maori. I was told to forget about the language and concentrate on English, forget about going to the rural areas where our whakapapa came from. I thought that the only other option was to be Pakeha and it wasn't until I was told what a Pakeha was that I realized that I couldn't be that. And then from there it was a long hard road to find an identity.

I set a high standard of participation and that's because when I was younger I didn't participate really. At school I had a choice. It was either 'be Maori, be the minority and accept all the bullying and everything that came with it, or acknowledge my other whakapapa, which is Tahitian and Rarotongan or Pakeha. I chose to identify as Tahitian and Rarotongan and then became part of the majority of my school because they were mostly Pacific Islanders. To be ashamed of a part of your life is mamae. That decision that I made as a young adult hurt, so I promised myself that I would never deny it again. So out of the choices I made when I was younger, I've driven myself to be a part of my culture. I think our culture encapsulates a lot of ethical things that help people to grow. We need to have a culture that we can accept on our own level. I don't think it really matters what the bigger group thinks, as long as you can find your own basis to belong.

The funny thing is that my experience of acknowledging who I was, or what I am, was actually inspired by two people that aren't Maori. One was Martin Luther King and that was because he explored oppression about a group of people gaining a voice. So I immersed myself in that because I thought the way that he approached things - like non-violence - and the messages that he had for his own people were honorable

things. So I suppose after I found out that I couldn't be Pakeha, I wanted to be negro (laughs).

The second person for me was Bob Marley. I think his music spoke of gaining an identity. The link between both of them was that they talked about Africa as a base for their culture. I realized that Maori had all of those things that they were talking about and all of those things that Bob Marley and Martin Luther King were talking about are parts of 'our culture'. That realization was a massive thing to me and that's when I started to acknowledge and participate and confront my own perceptions. As young Maori males I think a lot of us see Bob Marley as somebody who sees and talks about our reality. Even though he is not talking about us as a people, he talks about our reality, about our struggle. The Maori males that I hung around with at the time embraced that because that's what they could see. I looked at society, and it wasn't my society and it had embraced all the things that said that Maori were bad as a people. No matter how good we tried to be, or how ethically-driven we tried to be, we were always put into a box. So I was angry at that stage and that anger was something that was significant. Overcoming that anger has been good. If you can see past it, then you can see a solution.

Education changed me heaps. I went to mainstream schooling and didn't embrace any Maori aspects of education. I was in kapahaka when I was in primary school but it was a token involvement. At the age of eighteen I decided, "ok then, sweet, I'm going to embrace this" and I went to Uni and did all the academic subjects, which did nothing for me. They didn't expand me as a person. I then chose to do social anthropology, sociology, philosophy and things like that. For me those papers really helped me to embed myself in Maoridom.

I had to accept that I had denied my Maori-ness for too long. It had felt bad and I thought I wouldn't do that again. That was empowering but that guilt is still there. I don't ever want to be there again. I don't think it's fair that the social structures that we have puts minorities in a place where they have to do that. Whether they are Maori or not, a culture can be lost just because of what's surrounding it.

I had a Tongan friend. He was the oldest in his family, he was fluent in his language, he had a comprehensive cultural knowledge, he still did traditional jobs that the eldest son should do, he was a wicked sportsman and academically-driven too. The balance he had was something that I wanted. I suppose having him around has set a basis for what I wanted. With my Samoan and Tongan mates, I will always be jealous of their experiences because their experiences are culturally-driven and I long for that. Now that I'm at this age I just want to provide that environment for my son. I don't want to drown him in it though. I'll leave him and when he is interested I'll talk to him about that interest and when he is not interested, then that's alright.

At the end of my first undergrad year at University I got my moko. I got sick of people looking at me and saying "oh yeah, you're Samoan, you're Tongan" and I was like "nah, I'm Maori". My whakaaro was "now you can't mistake who I am". It makes me feel different as well, even if it's covered, I'm still empowered. In a professional environment as a teacher I worry about perceptions, but the thing is, it's not the kids, it's the parents. It's an empowering experience to get it and to wear it with pride and to be able to show it if you want. I explain to the kids the cultural significance of it, especially the young Maori boys. I tell them clearly that it is not for fashion but I tell them the significance for me and how it links me back to the many generations of my tipuna. All parents see is the social stigma that is attached to it. It's harder to explain and overcome those perceptions than it is to explain the significance to a child. An underlying motivation for my moko was showing it. It is easy for me to share parts of my culture if people can see what I am and if I can bring who I am to the surface.

Its a bit like when you look at a treasure chest and you just want to know what's in there, but no one will open it. At this stage of my life they've opened the treasure chest so I can have a look. That's why it's significant, because now I can look in the treasure chest when before I just knew it was there. That's probably because I live close to the marae now. I am somebody who's lived away from our marae and has come back to experience and to promote the good things about us. Even though it's Maori-driven, it's the people really, and out of that motivation comes a drive to achieve things and not deny your Maori-ness in the process.

My Pakeha heritage is embedded in mum's family and even though I never actually put my finger on what it was, we've always known that it's there. It's not something we've denied. I suppose it's just something that we haven't really had a chance to acknowledge yet. It's like 'sleeping with the enemy'. We know we are part of that group, but they are what got us where we are today.

The complexity of being Maori is interacting with brothers and sisters who are immersed in our culture but are also immersed in social structures outside of the bounds of reality, like gangs. It's complex because I go to them for the knowledge that they have about being Maori because 20 or 30 years ago gangs were the only place that our culture could survive in urban areas outside of marae. Society pushed our culture right to the edge, to nearly extinction. The only places that fostered it was gangs. Lost Maori males and females went there and found they could learn the language, they could learn about their culture. Fair enough, they made their own adaptations and everything but then that's what every Maori does. So for me it's complex, because I go to them for the cultural knowledge but when I go to an academic for the same knowledge even though that knowledge might be similar, you can't reference the other group. It's like their voice isn't acknowledged or is invalid. It's that validity that I find really hard. It's cultural knowledge, so shouldn't it be valid straight away? I suppose it's that old one about a verbal culture versus a written culture. How do you hold the mana of those traditional verbal ideals when you've got to use academic theories, which dilute it. The mana is diluted because you have to use theories that may have previously been used to justify the oppression of Maori. I suppose that's the biggest challenge.

But the rewards are wicked. Trying to give those old stories a voice, that's the real reward. The reward is trying to get past the complexities. The reward is the struggle. The reward is being empowered by it, instead of being angry. Being able to talk about it and help other people in that decision-making part. Before I used to think, "No, you can't have that view because that's against what I believe". The major reward is being humble enough to hear other people's point of view even if it isn't what you believe.

Khylee's Story

My mother has influenced my sense of identity. My parents split when I was a toddler and both parents are Maori. My mother's Ngapuhi and my father's Ngati Porou. I only recently met my father for the first time about three or four months ago. I definitely have a very strong maternal identification with my mother's relatives. My mother's very involved (she's an Anglican minister in the *minihare*). My mother married my Pakeha step-father, who adopted me. He's been a fantastic father. Having a Pakeha step-father has also influenced me to the extent that I'll always respect his parents as my grandparents. It's something that I always think about; not only do I have Pakeha whakapapa anyway, but his role in my life and that of his family is important. I must be respectful of them. This is always a concern. He is extremely supportive of my mother's 'marriage' to the church and her relations.

With regards to my dual identity, I don't know if it's a common phenomenon, but pretty much in all aspects of life in NZ, there is an assumption of whiteness. You don't identify unless you're not white. It's something that comes up in the media quite often and I think as a criminal lawyer it is always really obvious. I was watching the news when they picked up that suspect for the Berget Bauer murder inquiry. At the time TV3 and the Herald referred to him as "*part-Maori - could pass as European*", and I thought, "*pass* - What is this? 1950's Alabama?" Without having any idea of what he looked like, I saw that description and thought, "hey, *European*, can't you use the word *Pakeha* (there is always a political issue in the media about that), "*caucasian, from the Caucasious mountains – not*". So the fact they use the term 'European' offended me and then the fact that 'he could pass ...' like that was a positive thing. I thought, "Watch out there are Maori amongst you". It's hysterical. Then when I actually saw him in the news, well, I thought, 'oh my gosh, that man's as Maori as they come'. He looked like a Tuhoe bushman! Where is he 'passing'? He certainly wouldn't be 'passing' in Dunedin.

So the media perception and the media labelling of who people are, particularly since the Orewa speech, has polarised both Maori and non-Maori students. For Maori

students generally I think that the backlash has been in a positive sense, because “you are with us or against us”. You can no longer sit back and think ‘well may be I am for this reason or maybe I’m not’. It really forced people to look at the issues – good and bad.

In regards to dual identity, the assumption that you are Pakeha unless otherwise labelled or requested actually has a trickle down effect in my own life. I think ‘why bother if you don’t need to address that?’ So I never have really thought about my one Pakeha grandparent because he’s the norm. The other three aren’t, despite the fact that in my genetic make-up they are the majority. They are a minority in national consciousness. In the new century this is going to change because soon being Pakeha will be the minority compared to other non anglo-saxon migrants.

My partner is Paheka too. We have two children with another one on the way. The way we run our nuclear family is probably a bit different from the way my upbringing was. Obviously I look Pakeha, my children look even more Pakeha and that’s required some in-depth discussion. My partner’s a teacher, and so in terms of things like education, that’s required quite in-depth discussion between us as to whether our children are educated in Maori or even given Maori names. That’s a constant learning process because parenting, like general identity, is hardly something that you really ever think about. “I’m going to do it in this way when I have children” or you might think about it in theory but when it happens, you’re like, “I’m not giving my kids a heavy tupuna name to carry around with them and expect them to be the next person to chop down the flag pole or something”. So I named my children Levi and Georgia. They have Maori names ‘in there’ but again, I think about whether I’m making choices for them or leaving it open. That is a constant source of guilt, worrying about whether or not you’re doing the right thing - if you’ve got the balance. I have friends who are in similar positions to us that have kids that look like Pakeha, or are Pakeha, who send their blue-eyed, blond-haired kids off to kohanga. Those kids are actually getting a hard time and I don’t want, aside from the bigger picture identity issues, my kids to have the same concerns. It’s exactly the same with having Pakeha kids at a decile one Mangere school or vice versa. No one wants to be the odd one out, no matter what good you think you’re doing them.

When I was at University going through a 'renaissance stage' I was quite resentful of my parents having this 1960's, 1970's view of te reo being a useless thing, but I've inherited it and I'm really embarrassed about that. Although I have general ideas about it, there is this constant feeling of guilt for not 'walking the talk' and thinking "am I doing the right thing?" Am I actually making it harder for them to make their own choices later? I'm doing exactly what my mother did to me by saying, "you can do Maori at University". Maybe it would be easier if we (meaning 'we' as parents) made these decisions earlier.

Being Maori is significant in that I'm employed specifically as a Maori lecturer so that means both in terms of whakapapa (that identify as Maori) and the substance of what I teach in my job is primarily Maori focused. Important to that though, in terms of the mission of the Law school and the University as a whole, is the idea that Maori front non-Maori teaching also, so I do that as a criminal lawyer too. It's important to give people the idea that we don't just teach 'Maori stuff' and it gives people an idea that you are as credible as your non-Maori colleagues. So it's not just in the substance of what I teach but also in terms of the awhina relationships to Maori students - the pastoral care responsibilities. These are significantly different with my Pakeha colleagues than they are for me. Those things are required to be taken into account in terms of your assessment, with promotion etc. It is at the very core of my work and our collective identification as Maori colleagues at work.

For my own thesis (which is on Maori women in prison) I have been reading where identity, in particular cultural alienation, is a major factor for people that offend - Maori in particular. I've been reading in relation to analogous situations with other indigenous people (in particular indigenous women) and I've been reading these theories from America, which emerged in the 1960's in relation to the black renaissance and then later the Indian renaissance of the 1970's. A lot of these theorists refer to the process of 'negressance'. I think it really applies to here where you don't overtly identify until there's a reason for doing it, because for myself, looking Pakeha, there's an assumption of whiteness. I have to have a reason to tell people that "I'm not

Pakeha - I'm Maori". When you're a young person that's an issue. You think, "I'm not going to put my hand up and say, hello - kia ora, I'm Maori".

These theorists talk about the stages in your life. You have a pre-encounter phase where you're not particularly concerned with overtly identifying one way or the other. Your physical likeness generally tells people or they make assumptions of who you are based on what you look like. So that's a pre-encounter stage. Then you have an 'encounter', where you are forced to identify. My encounter involved two things - the end of secondary schooling and the beginning of University.

At seventeen I didn't overtly identify as Maori at school because there was no reason to. This sounds a bit silly but we didn't have a te reo teacher; you had to learn te reo through correspondence, which was a hassle. The attitude, both at home and school, was that te reo wasn't a particularly useful subject and because I was going to law school, I didn't think it would be useful. I'm embarrassed to think of that now.

There was no kapahaka. It was a big urban school but not a place where being Maori was a good thing. The Maori kids who hung out together were trouble and I was an academic learner, a middle class Maori, so I was not socially and in other areas 'Maori'. Being Maori would be the only connection we had. We didn't have anything else in common; I was very un-sporty.

There was no reason for me to overtly put my hand up to be Maori at school. I would never deny it. I was kind of living a dual life. I was really Maori at home and school was school. Then at the end of 6th form, I got the top 6th form grades for New Zealand for 6th Form Certificate and won the Ngarimu Maori scholarship worth \$35,000. At that stage, even then, I sort of thought, 'of course I am entitled to that, I'm Maori'. I had to go back to school to be presented with this scholarship before I went to University and the principal said to me, "I never knew you were Maori" and I thought, "you never asked!" And it made it really obvious to me that I hadn't done anything to identify myself and I was quite embarrassed by that.

So when going to University, I made a conscious decision on the very first day. At University in those days you had to line up to get the Dean's signature for law school.

There was a desk there and two leaving Maori law students were sitting at this desk and one of them stood up and yelled out to this group of people, “are there any Maori in this line?” and without even thinking I just said “yes!” My Pakeha partner (we have been together for years) said, “Oh my gosh” and I said, “Yes, I did it!” So what I did in the first five minutes of University, influenced my entire five year student life at the University. I primarily identified as Maori from the word go. I felt so relieved about it. That meant that I was attached to a Maori law students group and to the general roopu of all nga tauira Maori. It made it so easy; rather than me having to do something, I was kind of prompted by an external influence to do it. Those people are my closest friends and have influenced the work that I do.

These two things, winning the scholarship and being prompted to overtly identify as Maori, have been the two biggest changes in my life in terms of identification. Everybody at university, including the students, automatically knows that I identify primarily as Maori. It is much easier for people that look overtly Maori. I consciously have to make a decision to put on my ‘bone’ or pounamu. I don’t have to do that now and it’s quite a relief to not have to do that. Pakeha students automatically assume that I am Maori because that’s how I am presented in the handbook, that’s how I present myself in classes in terms of substance and procedure. It’s a relief I think.

Generally speaking I would think obviously that the key expectation in identifying as Maori is that you whakapapa Maori. I think that goes without saying. In terms of participation in Maori processes or behaviours, that’s quite changeable. Language is probably a key political issue for the post-native schooling generation and again I think that’s desirable but not necessary. I say that as a non-te reo speaker myself and as a non-kohanga and kura pupil.

I think these things are all shaped by the social and economic necessities of where you live, who you identify with, who your partner is, who your whanau is and what connection you have with your whanau. So again that can be changeable, especially for someone like myself who is an urban Maori. I was born and raised in Auckland, so my expectations of what I would think is appropriate in relation to my papakainga would be that I do what I can. In terms of social processes this would mean

appropriate showing of face at hui and tangi and just choosing to identify and living appropriately according to tikanga.

One the complexities with regards to identity is deciding what your criteria are for membership. If we don't all look like Tama Iti, then you know it's not that easy to identify people. So you need to formulate appropriate criteria that doesn't sort of say, 'this is an authentic Maori'. That's a difficulty.

There are obviously financial rewards in the modern context, in particular with regards to Treaty settlements. For example, my iwi has a deed up for ratification in a couple of weeks. Two of the key issues are "who are members?" The criteria is being formulated solely based like whakapapa, which I am kind of a bit 'iffy' about. The other aspect of this criteria is the governance, in terms of constitutional issues like how we use assets and what they are used for. In a cynical sense you could say that that gives people an incentive to belong but I think the bigger picture is that even if you put your hand up possibly for the wrong reason, wanting to belong to this group that has all these assets now, there will inevitably be benefits from being a part of this new collective. It actually gives people a way in, if you like. It's difficult, especially for an adult, if you go to te reo classes and things like that these days, you often see people in their 50's and 60's who really have no cultural connection, who are in some sense 're-inventing' themselves. But things like forced registration for iwi settlement purposes have the benefit of allowing people (like tuhono) to know the different processes. It's really difficult as an adult to put a hand up and say,, "hey, I want to be a part of the group" because people ask, "why? What is in it for us?" It's an easy way of re-connecting.

There are lot of difficulties that go with that, for example, for urban/rural divide, the urban-raised Maori. How do you negotiate relationships with people like the kaitiaki of where you live who do the business everyday? Then us 'townies' with our qualifications come in. We are never quite sure, even with the best intentions, when we have a mandate or a chance to speaks in terms of age, gender, or whether the fact that you're a townie, counts you out. Those things are really difficult and Maori are much harder on each other than they are on Pakeha. Helen Clark comes and, "hello,

you can speak”, and we are like, “hello, who are you? I’m a local and I’m never going to get a chance to speak”. So matching the theory with the practice is also quite difficult and finding room, you know, we are always told that tikanga is flexible and it’s principle based, and then when you actually call it to account, where you try to call their bluff, people quite often are very hard and fast and say, “no, this is the way we do things”. Especially when some old man says, “sit down girly, you townies don’t know what you’re talking about”.

There are immense benefits to identification and another thing that’s changed is we are becoming more location specific, iwi specific, or hapu specific. This is a positive thing I think, getting away from the homogenous model. There is now cognisance of the fact that when you go to a te reo course that it might be Ngati Porou reo or Northern reo or whatever. Ten years ago people wouldn’t even give that a second thought and assumed we were all the same.

Hailey-Jane's Story

Identifying as Maori has a lot to do with how I was brought up. I've always thought of myself as Maori. I think it's been the huge influence that my Maori whanau has played in my life. Even though I've had influences from my Pakeha whanau as well I felt that I was more connected and more comfortable just identifying as Maori.

There has always been a huge push for us in terms of tikanga, looking after manuhiri (tiaki manuhiri) and making sure everyone feels comfortable. Our family were quite lucky in that a lot of them never moved away from the iwi, from the hapu, so they were able to maintain the reo. Being brought up here and surrounded by that shapes the way that we think and the way that we interact with each other. We have got the tikanga and we've got te reo. We are proud to belong to this group and to say that we are Maori. I've never been in a situation where I've been whakama or shy of it. I've actually always been proud of being Maori, even when I was going to school. I was a minority and a lot of the other Maori kids were quite embarrassed to be Maori but I'm fortunate that I had strong whanau who were Maori and they really supported us in being brought up as Maori.

I have always been involved in kapa haka and I did Maori right through school. People just saw me as Maori. I think a few people got a shock because I'm quite fair and so there were those sorts of issues, "can she speak Maori?" and that sort of thing. This came from mainly older people actually. They would be quite sort of surprised that I could. My grandmother was the Maori teacher at school and so people were aware of my connections. They knew we were Maori and were very much into Maori things. My grandmother had such huge connections with the community, the iwi and the hapu and she was the type of person that was just well-known in our area. I think there is just the expectation that our whanau function like that.

The focus on whanau things were entrenched in us. When I think about it whanau things were huge; in fact, we always attended every event - a huritau, a wedding, a wananga or hui. It was ingrained in us as little kids; me and my brother, we were the 'hui hoppers'. We use to go with our nannies and we used to go to all the hui. As well

as all those things, our hahi, our religion is Ratana and we have such strong connections with our hahi and its all in te reo as well.

We had our hahi, we had kura, and I was interested in Maori things like kapa haka and wakaama. I feel like I was surrounded by Maori things.

When I moved to Auckland, although I didn't have my immediate whanau, I become a part of a new whanau when I went to Huarahi Maori. Having good lecturers with expertise really reinforced my being Maori. I think when I was growing up I took it for granted that I was Maori. I didn't know any different, but when I moved to Auckland and started learning about Kaupapa Maori I realised I hadn't been taught the preciousness of te reo. I didn't actually know all these things. I didn't know about language revitalization and the struggle that we've gone through. I didn't realize I was born into a decade in the 1980's where things were already changing. I didn't even know I was a part of that. The attitudes were already changing. So when I went there, (Huarahi Maori) I became conscientised. I wanted to be a Maori teacher; I didn't know about the whole revitalization and how important it was and things like that because we had always had it. I'm from a place, luckily enough, where we haven't had to look at re-establishing our reo in our family because it has always been there. So it makes me realize how lucky we are and also how I can help other people. I realize that other people have this feeling of loss and often they haven't had Maoritanga; they haven't had te reo.

In thinking about why I wrote Maori and not Maori/European I realise it's because when my whanau fill out things for me they've always just written Maori. I've just sort of followed that. I've never really thought about "maybe I should be acknowledging my other side". It's not that I don't, I just *feel* Maori. It's only when people ask me about it, that I think, "oh yeah, I am something else as well". My dad's mum has written a book actually and it's all about our Maori **and** Pakeha whakapapa. It takes us back to England. It's not that I don't know about it, I do know about it. It's just another part of me.

It feels like I can do things that are more Maori. You can do things that sort of characterize you more as Maori, like you can do kapa haka and we know that's Maori. What are the things that sort of distinguish you as a Pakeha person?

I'm not sure why but sometimes in my own Pakeha family they'll do things and I don't feel comfortable with them doing it. I'm not sure why that is. I think, "oh, that's just a Pakeha whakaaro, that's just another Pakeha way of doing things". I don't agree with it and I'm not sure why I don't agree with it. I think it comes down to things tika and right or wrong. My Maori side for some reason shows the right way to do it. I spend a lot of time reflecting on that thing that makes me so Maori but I haven't reflected on what makes me not so European and not so Pakeha.

I'm a Maori teacher so that's got a huge part to play; that's where I'm happiest. I have been a mainstream teacher as well in mainstream schools but teaching Maori became my niche. I thought, "this is what I'm supposed to be doing". I learned about language revitalization and looking at those younger generations coming through who come from families who haven't had the reo. The fact that they are starting to re-generate their own language is really awesome. Working with Maori tamariki is awesome.

My whanau are bringing up my pepi. She is going to be bi-lingual. I love it that all our whanau are around, having an influence in her life. We have got an aunty that lives with us and my sister and also my nan's partner, so all of them having that influence and just having a shared role in bringing her up, is really special. She's got all that support and it's a really huge thing in our family. My nana comes from a family of 14 kids and we're a huge part of each other's lives. All of my cousins and second cousins go to each other's twenty-firsts, we all go to each others birthdays and it's just what we do in our family.

Trying to find a balance between things Maori as well as seeking out the other things that exist in Te Ao Huri – the changing world, is a challenge. We want to retain our Maoritanga, our tikanga, our customs and all those types of things but in another sense we need to try to seek out all the new things that are happening in technology etc. We need to find the balance to be able to maintain ourselves and ground

ourselves in tikanga but also to also accept new things as well. I find sometimes older Maori are more interested in maintaining and not departing with the old knowledge. I can refer that to my great-grandmother who is still alive. She has got a lot of matauranga that she only wants to impart to certain people and I think that tends to be an old way of thinking.

I am lucky that I am a part of the whole process. Being a teacher and being a person that's going to hopefully regenerate te reo within my own hapu and my own iwi. The next generation may be Maori speakers again. That's exciting.

Brenda's Story

There's really no complex answer with regards to my identity. I am Maori because my father is Maori. Growing up, I always preferred to identify myself as that. I feel as though I look more Maori than Pakeha. I've always wanted to reinforce that that is the cultural group that I'm from because people can get confused about my identity. My family, like my mum and also our extended family on her side (not relations but family and friends), have always been people who really promoted Maoritanga, the culture and the heritage. My dad is actually the Maori one but he didn't encourage me to acknowledge it at all. He can speak it quite fluently but won't. I'm not sure whether that is indicative of his age group, but it's like it is something to be ashamed of. I think there was a kind of belief that you should put that stuff aside in this world. Now people would say hang on, that stuff *is* me; I can't put what matters to me aside. There has been a shift.

My mother always thought it was important that I have a strong sense of identity. I do too with my daughter, Olivia. I think parents know that if you don't know your background and where you're from, you may feel lost. I think mum took that on as her role because my dad wasn't proud of his identity. She was the one that encouraged me to stick with learning Maori at school. I'm lucky. When I was at high school I didn't really want to study Maori as a subject through to seventh form, but that was one thing my mother did make me do and I'm glad she did. It gave me a lot of exposure to tikanga - things that you wouldn't do everyday. Otherwise I would have grown up like a white person.

When I was at Auckland Girls Grammar and Ponsonby Intermediate I was proud to be a Maori. I don't have a specific time I can remember that really made me think, 'that's the group I want to identify myself with' but just in general I think school instilled in me a sense of pride in being Maori.

Since having Olivia I try and use the language a lot more at home and just teaching little things like "ka kite", don't sit on tables etc. I try to promote those little things at home just so that she will have more of an appreciation or awareness of Maori culture. Throughout my life I haven't had any pressure to learn the language, probably

because I wasn't going on to marae and all that kind of thing. Mum said that when I was really young I would say, 'look at those Maoris over there'. I didn't realise that I was one. I now see Olivia doing that as well. She's like, 'I'm not a Maori', and I'm like, 'yes you are'. But at high school when I did kapa haka and that, I was always proud of it and never felt ashamed.

With regards to expectations, I think in the Maori community people refer or defer to elders a lot more in terms of decision-making. As you go through life you look more to your elders for advice or guidance than perhaps some other cultures do, specifically Pakeha. I think there's more of an emphasis on including the family in day-to-day activities and raising children. This is something I place a lot of importance on. I think that it is a really positive aspect of our culture. I think that when you identify yourself as a Maori it's extremely important to promote the culture and also defend the culture. A lot of negative discussion goes on around the Treaty or university entrance, so I think it's important to promote it by being successful yourself, but also by defending these things to people who are non believers or racist. We need to try to educate them as to how we see things, how we view the world, what our viewpoint is.

In later life the friends that I've made have been influential. My best friend's husband is Maori. He is staunch about being Maori and that always makes me feel the same. When we all go out together he really leads the way in terms of 'yeah we're Maori, we're not going to pretend like we're not, we're gonna say Kia ora to the waiter and that kind of thing'. I really enjoy going out with them. I've got a couple of friends, involved in Maori health and Maori radio, so whenever we do things with their families we talk about where we are from and Maori issues. It's just almost a relief when you do that openly. I think even our mannerisms and stuff are similar, you know, like having a silly laugh. It great to have people around you that actually share your thoughts or point of view, rather than feeling like you have to explain constantly to people who question or challenge you. You just get sick of it. You get fired up and angry.

Being Maori has no significance in my current professional life, although like I said in the past, it has been in my work in larger public organizations. I now work in a private

corporate organisation. The challenge or complexity here is having to constantly overcome stereotypes. For example, 'Maori are lazy and they like to have a drink'. I actually come across those types of comments all of the time. Someone will say a racist joke. There's a perception that Maori are not successful, not hard working, probably not particularly intelligent. That is the main problem that I've come up against.

The reward is having a great sense of identity. Our culture has got a lot more depth than my partner, Richard's. He's from England. They have a long history but I don't think it's much of a '*culture*'. We have specific things we do, ways we behave and traditions we acknowledge. I think that's a good thing because it makes me proud. I like being associated with successful Maori people; we have got sports people and I really like it when they promote the culture as well. The key thing is that it's really important to try to be a role model for other Maori.

Chapter 8

Acknowledge the people. This story is theirs.

E mihi ki te iwi. No ratau tenei korero.

Findings

This chapter details two themes that emerge from the analyses of the six participant interviews. The themes contribute to answers to the key question regarding the complexities involved in articulating an ethnic identity as a person of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. The chapter begins by discussing each participant's choice of 'ethnic label' and the key factors identified as influencing these labels. Subsequently, the two key themes are discussed that focus respectively on a) exclusion and inclusion as Maori and b) self-definition – a third space. The next chapter analyses, in more depth, the key influences on the participant's ethnic identity development.

All six participants were of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. Three were the offspring of parents with both Maori and Pakeha lineage and three were of a Maori and a Pakeha parent. Of those interviewed, five are female and one is male. All interviewees were aged between 27 and 40 at the time of the interview. Interviewees had a range of iwi affiliations including Tainui, Ngati Kahungunu, Ngapuhi, Ngati Whatua, Whakatohea and Ngati Porou. One participant does not know her iwi affiliations because her Maori parent refuses to reveal them.

Four participants grew up in larger provincial centres or cities and two come from rural or outlying districts. Brenda, Ramona, Hailey-Jane, Matt and Khylee identified as Maori solely. Nicola chose to identify as mixed Maori/Pakeha. The various reasons why five of the six participants, who have more than one ethnic option, chose to identify as solely Maori will now be discussed.

Brenda commented, "There's really no complex answer with regards to my identity. I am Maori because my father is Maori". In Brenda's case it is interesting to note that she was raised by a Pakeha mother and has no knowledge of her Maori whakapapa. Yet it is heartening to know that she still strongly identifies as Maori. Like Mead

(2003), Brenda feels her father's whakapapa gives her the right to say, 'I am Maori'. Typically, the view within the wider Maori community is that, in order to be considered Maori, one must identify as Maori and be descended from a Maori (Mason Durie, 1998; Karetu, 1990; R. Walker, 1990). Brenda also cites phenotype, or physical characteristics, as a contributing influence stating, "I feel as though I look more Maori than Pakeha". This is a particularly salient comment because studies have shown that persons who have features typically associated with a particular racial or ethnic group tend to be perceived and treated as a group member, irrespective of how they self-identify (Hughes & Hertel, 1990; Rockquemore & Brunisma, 2002; Waters, 1996). Therefore, Brenda's physical appearance, and other people's response to her appearance, have further influenced her identification as Maori.

Ramona feels that both her whakapapa and cultural experiences qualify her as Maori. She states, "I identify myself in relation to those who have had the greatest influence in my life...including my whanau and most significantly my mother". Ramona also states that, "they [her whanau] have helped me to understand the value of...being Maori". This kind of familial socialisation has had a major influence on Ramona's sense of ethnic identity. Her sense of being Maori is also enhanced by her extensive knowledge of the obligations, expectations and conformity to group norms expected for group membership. She states, "I also understand that there is much that I am expected to do that is specific to a Maori tikanga context, marae protocol, kawa and the like". She, however, places most emphasis on the benefits of association when she comments, further on in her interview, that she has "a connection to the whenua" and knowledge of values connected to manaakitanga (caring), whakawhanaungatanga (relationships) and kotahitanga (unity) in her family. She states that this is how she has come to "judge the Maori-ness of myself and others...and they are the values I choose to pass on to my own children".

Hailey-Jane's identification as Maori stems from a variety of reasons, including living in an area with a strong concentration of Maori, being a Maori teacher and having a Maori partner and child. These can be considered important predictors of identifying solely as Maori, alongside other predictors like the ethnicity and descent of parents and grandparents, participation in Maori networks and physical appearance (Kukutai, 2003). Familial socialisation, that is, being raised in a household that emphasises

Maori culture and networks, is also likely to have influenced Hailey-Jane's identification choice (Kukutai, 2005).

As a child and adolescent, Matt struggled to embrace his ethnic identity. His life experiences have meant that he has consistently had a negative and unflattering perception of Maori. He was constantly "told to forget about being Maori". Matt now chooses to identify as Maori because he has come to understand the negative influence the media and other stereotypes have had on his sense of being Maori. He now finds his self-definition as Maori "empowering" and participation in higher education has been the main vehicle for learning about 'real' Maori history, alongside becoming more involved in his marae and iwi activities. Matt currently lives and teaches on his iwi papakainga.

Both Khylee's parents are Maori and she cites whakapapa as her main reason for identifying as Maori. She discussed throughout her interview the many reasons why she did not feel the need to ever openly identify as Maori, including comments like, "you don't overtly identify until there's a reason for doing it, because for myself, looking Pakeha, there's an assumption of whiteness. I have to have a reason to tell people that "I'm not Pakeha - I'm Maori". When you're a young person that's an issue; you think, "I'm not going to put my hand up and say, hello - kia ora, I'm Maori...why bother if you don't need to address that?" She also stated, "At seventeen I didn't overtly identify as Maori at school because there was no reason to". Khylee never openly denied her ethnicity but never openly acknowledged it either. As a young adult she realised she "...hadn't done anything to identify myself and [I] was quite embarrassed by that".

Nicola is the only participant to state she is Maori/Pakeha. Her primary reason for this is that she doesn't feel "...qualified to say that I'm specifically Maori. I don't feel I'm able to say that I'm Maori, because... the 'Maori' package doesn't fit me. I don't fit into that stereotypical Maori mould". Nicola's perception of her own ethnicity has been shaped significantly by others' reactions to her non-typical Maori phenotype – both Maori and non-Maori. As a child she was not challenged about her ethnicity (probably because her brothers were more obviously physically Maori). Throughout her adult life, however, she has constantly been challenged regarding the authenticity

to her claim of Maori identity. Most challenges are with regard to her fair skin and hair. Another influential factor in her identification as Maori/Pakeha is her mother's Pakeha lineage and her feelings of 'guilt' should she not acknowledge it.

None of the participants talked in any detail about their Pakeha lineage. All acknowledged it, but this acknowledgement was, overwhelmingly, the most significant reference to their Pakeha lineage. Possible reasons for this are discussed further in the next chapter.

Themes emerging from the data

Two clear themes emerge from an analysis of the participants' narratives. The factors that had the most significant impact on the participants' ethnic identity development were their experiences with a) exclusion and inclusion and b) negotiating and eventually self-defining their ethnic identity. A sentiment particularly pertinent in describing the participants' experiences was expressed by Johnston (in Kitzenger, 1989) when she stated, "Identity is what you say you are according to what they say you can be" (p.82). This study is as much about how hybrid Maori/Pakeha construct their own identities as it is about how their identities are shaped by the societal contexts in which they live. At one level these stories provide insights into Maori/Pakeha personal identity development, but at another level their stories also identify variables such as family values and behaviours, geographic location and education.

The six participants' stories in this study are individual and do not sit neatly or uniformly together. The stories are not homogenous but instead reflect personal, problematic and often contradictory experiences. This section seeks to provide an analysis of the commonalities and points of difference in the participants' stories, with regard to the two main themes, and aims to locate these stories in their socio-cultural and political realities. The following chapter and associated participant quotations provide a snapshot of the participants' feelings about the formation of a sense of dual ethnic identity at a particular point in their life and is in no way a representation of an 'end point' with regard to their ongoing ethnic identity development.

Exclusion/Inclusion

All the participants had experiences of exclusion and inclusion at one time or another while growing up which were a potent force in their ethnic identity formation. Both exclusion and inclusion are experiences that are centred in power relations (McIntosh, 2005) and often this meant that the participants felt ignored, trivialised, silenced, rendered invisible and made ‘other’ or conversely included with a true sense of belonging. These experiences often occurred within the participants’ immediate communities and families, but were also imposed upon them by other people in their social contexts, for example, in school and work contexts.

Some participants felt marginalised by non-Maori for claiming Maori descent. In these contexts they felt that non-Maori were judging their claim to Maori ethnicity based on their presumptions about markers of authenticity. These markers were often based on media-fed stereotypes. Nicola’s non-Maori phenotype meant that she was firstly excluded by her non-Maori colleagues because of their ignorance about her ethnicity, and then excluded again because of her ‘open’ claim to Maori ethnicity. The anti-Maori feeling continued in her work environment and later became the key reason for Nicola leaving her job. Nicola often felt marginalised in her work environment because of the constant anti-Maori discussions that occurred. She “wasn’t happy with the racial slurs directed at Maori” and reported that “[I had to] put my hand up straight away to say that I’m Maori” and say, “I’m not going to tolerate this”. In the focus group discussion Nicola commented that in making this stand she further alienated herself from her workmates because she established herself as ‘other’ in challenging their racism.

Despite factors like opportunity, environment, resources, aptitude and motivation, te reo Maori is seen as one of the most potent markers of an ‘authentic Maori’ (Kukutai, 2004; McIntosh, 2005). Ramona experienced exclusion from non-Maori based on her lack of proficiency in te reo. In completing a paper at a tertiary institution she felt marginalised by an assignment that asked her to write about the defining markers of Maori ethnicity. The research provided suggested very narrow criteria for defining

Maori ethnicity. Some of the markers suggested were “‘te reo’ and ‘tikanga’ and ‘Kaupapa Maori’ and ‘Maori myths and legends’”. Ramona confronted the lecturer about the ‘fixed’ nature of these markers, because they insinuated that the only Maori who could lay claim to Maori identity were those that could ‘prove’ their authenticity via proficiency in te reo. Ramona felt that this was inherently unfair because she had been kept from te reo due to socio-political circumstances beyond her control. Whilst understanding the primary political need for establishing such markers, Ramona feels that they are highly exclusionary in nature because of the unyielding criteria in place for inclusion. For many Maori, like Ramona, the inability to converse in te reo produces a strong sense of shame.

Alongside te reo, a non-typical Maori phenotype is considered the other reason that four participants experience exclusion or marginalisation. Throughout their interviews, Ramona, Khylee, Hailey-Jane and Nicola claim to not possess the physical features that are normally perceived as belonging to the Maori ethnic group. Khylee repeatedly claims to look “Pakeha” and comments that, “If we don’t all look like Tame Iti, then, you know, its not that easy”. Nicola similarly remarks that her “problem lies in the way I look. That ‘Maori’ package people doesn’t fit me. I don’t fit into that stereotypical Maori mould”. Ramona claims that her non-typical phenotype means that she is not only perceived as different, but treated differently. She says, “Because I was distinctly Pakeha looking with blue eyes, blonde hair and fair skin I was treated differently from my brother”. Even Hailey-Jane, the most proficient te reo Maori speaker claims to have felt occasionally marginalised because she is “quite fair”.

Despite their many exclusionary experiences, all the participants claim to have to have a strong sense of being Maori. The key reason for this strong sense of ethnic identity is that they can either claim whakapapa or, like Brenda, Maori ancestry. Whakapapa or ancestry has customarily underpinned any claim to being Maori. Stevenson (2004) also argues that membership in a cultural group requires a mandate for inclusion, and for Maori, this is a Maori ancestor. Thus, for all the participants, ancestry is seen as an objective basis for claiming a Maori identity. This sense of belonging was formed in their micro-environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) through interactions and experiences with family. Their experiences in identifying as Maori, in

the wider exo and macro-systems, were mostly exclusionary.

Experiences of exclusion and inclusion had a significant impact on the ethnic identity formation of all the participants. Being defined and redefined by others, both Maori and non-Maori, were important influences on their sense of belonging as ethnically Maori. Each participant highlighted in his/her story the uncomfortable position of feeling powerless in the face of defining mechanisms that sought to 'name' and 'other' him/her. Despite factors beyond their control such as stereotyping and external demands for authenticity (most significantly te reo and phenotype), all the participants identified as Maori. Their key for self-inclusion was whakapapa or ancestry. They all articulated that this gave them a right to claim, and a sense of belonging, to the Maori ethnic group.

Self-definition – a third space

All societies change and adapt and all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity (Rutherford, 1990). It is in this dynamic and shifting environment that the cultural politics of 'Maori-ness' are situated. However, this identity shift must be subject to re-negotiation and re-formation. The critical identity development shift for the participants was coming to understand their right to define and conceptualise their own identity, thus constructing an ethnic identity that defined the whole, rather than parts of themselves. They learnt, as adults, to negotiate for themselves an identity that was situational, fluid and comfortable. As Hall (1996) points out, like all things historical, ethnic identities constantly undergo transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to a continuous play of history, culture and power and at any one time are simply in a process of positioning. Thus, the participants' experiences, with conceptualising and re-conceptualizing, constructing and re-constructing and articulating and re-articulating their hybrid identities, give rise to a constant state of negotiation. Feelings of 'in-between-ness' (Meredith, 2004), dislocation (Bhabha, 1994b) and 'edge-walking' (Krebs, 1999) were merely another stage, factor or influence on their identity development, not an end point.

Pressure to choose one identity over another is commonly experienced as stress for children of dual ethnicity (Poston, 1990), particularly if they have not learnt to define themselves as 'both'. In exploring his ethnic identity, Matt felt he had to accept and reject various aspects of both ethnic groups. He wanted to 'try on' each ethnic identification in turn. He had learnt that being "Maori was the opposite of being Pakeha" and thus "aspired to be that, the other group, because I was told to forget about being Maori". In learning, via negative stereotypes from both Maori and non-Maori, that being Maori was not desirable he "thought that the only other option was to be Pakeha". When he learnt that he could not be solely Pakeha, he found it hard "being able to accept it". This early rejection of a Maori identity can be seen to be an early attempt to acculturate into the wider society, particularly at school. This choice, however, evoked feelings of disloyalty and guilt that have impacted on Matt's strong Maori identity as an adult. He now finds his ethnic identity choice empowering but this experience of culture conflict has meant that his strong identification with his Maori identity has significantly weakened his identification with his Pakeha identity.

The term 'edgewalkers' has been used in the United States with reference to people of mixed racial and ethnic heritage. Krebs (1999) states, "Edgewalkers do not shed one skin when they move from their cultures of origin to the mainstream and back. Edgewalkers maintain continuity wherever they go, walking the edge between two cultures in the same persona" (p75). This choice to express and live a dual ethnic identity has both disadvantages and benefits. Nicola feels that she has negotiated a placement in-between where she has the cultural richness of both ethnic groups. She indicates that at work her non-Maori phenotype makes her "dual heritage a bit of a novelty actually. I'm palatable, the way I look". As an adult, Nicola feels positive about her dual identity and enjoys the benefits it affords her. This is clear in her statements, "The benefit for me is that I can walk in both worlds. I know that I can fit in at a Pakeha gig" and in talking about a darker Maori friend, "She doesn't have the luxury that I do being able to be seen as both".

Ramona, Hailey-Jane, Brenda and Khylee have all experienced feelings of in-between-ness. They, however, have reached a point in their lives where they choose to identify as Maori solely. Declaring a Maori identity (when you are of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent) takes courage and can have benefits, but it does not always

have the desired recognition or understanding. Within a Maori socio-cultural context there are pressures to conform and those not brought up in that context commonly experience feelings of inadequacy, alienation or discomfort. All the participants acknowledged and articulated their Pakeha heritage but all felt a weak identification with the Pakeha culture, values and/or ways of behaving. Hailey-Jane stated blatantly that she feels “connected and more comfortable just identifying as Maori” and asks, “What are the things that sort of distinguish you as a Pakeha person?”

Although five of the six participants have attained some sense of belonging in both worlds, maintaining social contact with both worlds and contributing significantly to both worlds, they choose to self-identify as Maori. This self-naming can be considered a ‘third space’. Bhabha’s (1994b) notion of third space is appropriate here because it opens up a conceptual space that exceeds the insider, outsider, ‘them and us’ representations that currently exist. The participants’ hybridity does not mean they have to trace the two original moments from which they, the third, emerged. Rather, in this third space their uniqueness as hybrid individuals is fluid, situational and self-determined. The notion of third space is discussed in more depth in the two following chapters.

Chapter 9

Ma pango, ma whero, ka oti te mahi

By black and by red, the work is done

Discussion

Introduction

This chapter considers in more depth the ways in which hybrid Maori/Pakeha construct, reconstruct and articulate an ethnic identity that acknowledges, and indeed, embraces their dual ethnicity. An analysis of the participant narratives identified a number of key influences on the construction of their ethnic identity development including stereotyping, issues regarding authenticity and legitimacy, the media, the cultures influential in schools, universities and work, social networks, finding ‘voice’ (Hirschman, 1970), issues around naming self and finally the importance of maintaining borders and building bridges.

The construction of an ethnic identity is a dialectical process between an individual and others in their immediate social milieu (Erikson, 1980). Individuals become aware of themselves as objects in the social world and therefore form ideas about themselves that are consistent with the views of others around them (Hall & Du Gay, 1996). However, the idea of simple transmission of identity, particularly ethnic identity from parents to children, devoid of other contextual influences is naive. This study highlighted elements of both structure *and* agency (Giddens, Duneier, & Appelbaum, 2006), with a relatively strong emphasis on how structural constraints impact on people’s values and behaviours. Agency, in the context of this study, is the power of the individual participants to control their own identity formation. It must also be noted, however, that agency varies according to the knowledge/power that individuals possess. The key point here is that individual identities vary in fluid, complex ways. The participants in this study do not have fixed, unalterable, singular identities. Rather, they have made and remade themselves in their respective social settings according to their desires and aspirations.

Broad social structures, attitudes and ideologies influence individual perceptions and behaviour. The way the state, media and ethnic groups themselves treat people can have a profound effect on whether individuals align themselves with specific ethnic groups (Kukutai, 2003). Macro influences (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) on Maori/Pakeha identity development focus on the interaction between the historical construction of 'race', the resulting racism (particularly in the media), colonialism and the demand for legitimacy from both Pakeha and Maori that results from this interaction (Meredith, 1999b). Discourses about race and ethnicity rely on history, politics, spirituality, values and economics (Keddell, 2006) and these discourses define both how Maori/Pakeha are defined and how they define themselves. Thus, identity develops as a result of our personal response to these discourses and the social categorisation that occurs as a consequence of them. One significant type of social categorisation is stereotyping.

Stereotyping

A common factor mentioned in the participants' stories was the impact of labelling and/or stereotyping in the participants' lives. Stereotypes are always closely bound up with issues of representation and the term stereotyping today has come to mean the continuous repetition of ideas about groups of people (McQueen, 1998). It involves taking a feature of a group, real or imagined, and making it representative of the whole group. These simplified representations have attached to them implicit judgements about a group (covert value messages) that reinforce moral and political inequalities.

Brenda's comment is illustrative of the ways Maori are stereotyped:

The challenge or complexity here is having to constantly overcome stereotypes. For example, 'Maori are lazy and they like to have a drink'. I actually come across those types of comments all of the time. Someone will say a racist joke. There's a perception that Maori are not successful, not hard working, probably not particularly intelligent. That is the main problem that I've come up against.

Stereotypes such as this are damaging because they can become a self-fulfilling prophecy for Maori. Shane Edwards (1999) calls this one's determined identity and states that stereotypes become realities through the process of determined identity. Determined identity proposes that identity is constructed *for* individuals and that the individual has very little or no active role in shaping or determining their own identity. Dominant groups engage in shaping and determining the identity of minority groups, resulting in the dominant group oppressing the minority. Determined identity is oppressive because it reflects the dominant group's view of who or what someone can or cannot be and so defines the specifications for minority group and individual identity (Johnston, 1998). Stereotyping and/or determined identity in this context is hegemonic.

Johnston (1998) writes that non-Maori have engaged in various theoretical discourses that have located, defined and represented most Maori as different from non-Maori. In doing so, many Maori are defined in specific ways that are not necessarily how they see themselves. Determined identity consists of the dominant constructions and representations of minority group identities (Grosz, 1995). It is a discourse and practice of control that endeavours to define the realities of groups other than themselves. Within this paradigm, control and inequalities are maintained by the negative portrayal of the minority groups. Johnston (1998) comments on how the privileged and defining group often defines its own positive worth by negatively valuing the others. The reality is that this hegemonic, social conditioning continues to influence many Maori into relinquishing or denying their ethnic identity, but it not only victimises the individual but also their families, their culture – everything with which they identify (Gilborn, 1990). Rizvi (1993) also asserts that “popular racism [like stereotyping] does not so much determine the way children view the world as steer them toward certain interpretations. It is hegemonic in this way” (p.137).

However, Maori are not passive in the process of identity formation. Giddens' (1997) notion of ‘agency’ would suggest that even those participants with a relatively non-typical Maori phenotype had some degree of choice about whether or not they developed a Maori ethnic or cultural identity. This is also evidenced by the fact that even though the participants experienced complexity in constructing an ethnic identity they all chose to identify primarily or significantly as Maori. Thankfully, for Brenda,

her awareness of this blatant racist stereotyping helps her to reconcile any negative impact it may have had on her sense of Maori identity.

Authenticity and Legitimacy

Several participants talked about the pressure to 'prove their Maori-ness' to other Maori. Self-identification as Maori usually involves social/ethnic group acceptance as Maori (Collins, 2004) and as noted in the participant's stories, all have experienced varying levels of acceptance and belonging within cultural contexts such as school, university, work and on the marae. This demand for legitimacy acted as a major factor with regard to the way the participants located themselves in the political minefield that is identity politics.

All the participants experienced, in varying degrees, a sense of de-legitimisation by other Maori for not being a 'real Maori'. The participants' stories show that there are some pre-defined 'insider' and 'outsider' boundaries. These boundaries are often based on phenotypical characteristics such as skin colour, eye colour and hair type and essentialised cultural behaviours such as accent, dress and association. Stewart-Harawira (1993) comments that Maori who have fair skin and blue eyes are often discredited as not being 'real Maori' and this acts as an inhibiting factor in developing an identity as a Maori and in gaining social acceptance by Maori (Collins, 2004). Looking Pakeha and carrying all the negative stereotypes associated with that 'privileged, coloniser, dominant group' means that initial and often lingering negative reactions to 'fair Maori' frequently occur from both Maori and Pakeha (Bevan, 2000).

Appearances of various sorts (e.g. skin colour, clothing and hairstyle) are important to the process of human interaction because it is not possible to directly observe the intentions and character of individuals. It is through appearances that people evaluate both others and themselves (Ichheiser, 1970). Appearances present people's identities to others and allow them to infer the identities of others. Appearances help to define a situation and provide some cognitive context for all the individuals involved. In this sense, appearances can become a reality in and of themselves (Stone, 1962). However, hybrid Maori/Pakeha individuals' appearances are often times ambiguous and they exist in a variety of different social contexts of differing racial composition.

Ramona discusses the challenge to her sense of 'being Maori' in relation to a physical characteristics. She comments:

I used to find it sad that my Maori-ness was not acceptable to many Maori. I didn't understand why my own people would deny me my birthright...I am still criticized by some because I don't introduce myself in Maori. I felt quite empowered by the fact that I've chosen to identify myself as Maori. I wasn't waiting for someone to tell me you're not Maori because you have got blue eyes and fair skin.

Nicola discusses the challenge to her authenticity, based on both appearance and behaviour:

I guess my problem lies in the way I look. That 'Maori' package people doesn't fit me. I don't fit into that stereotypical Maori mould...There's definitely a way of talking and a way of existing, especially in Rotorua, Even in saying that, everyone in Rotorua (pronounced correctly) used to say 'Row-tow-ru-wa'. Maybe it's a new thing but if you want to identify as Maori now you say Rotorua (pronounced correctly). It's just the way you talk. A bit of 'bro-talk' is expected too, which I just refuse to do. The way you behave, the way you are dressed, the way you look affects others perceptions of your 'Maori-ness'. In my personal experience, if you dress in a certain way (dress up) you are pretending to be Pakeha, a fathead - whakahihi. I guess the job, being a police officer, doesn't help. It's not a very Maori job.

And Khylee speaks of the essentialised physical characteristics associated with 'real Maori':

One of the complexities, with regards to identity, is deciding what your criteria are for membership. If we don't all look like Tame Iti, then, you know, it's not that easy to identify people. So you need to formulate appropriate criteria that don't sort of say 'this is an authentic Maori'. That's a difficulty.

These participants felt that they were being forced to authenticate their claims in terms of presumed traditional or cultural characteristics in order to be seen as legitimate. The ultimate result of this is that some of them were rejected by the ethnic group (or individuals within that ethnic group) because they were not seen to have a legitimate claim to membership if they did not conform to rigid cultural values or perceived characteristics, whatever their ancestry (Anzaldúa, 1987). Abu-Lughod (1991) comments that “culture is the essential tool making other” (p.143). The reality for mixed Maori/Pakeha in Aotearoa is that te reo Maori and Maoritanga function as a basis of identity and solidarity (Bentley, 1999; Broughton, 1993; Collins, 1999; Edwards, 1999).

The focus on te reo Maori and Maoritanga as a basis for collective identity has many interesting aspects. The erection of such rigid, cultural boundaries could be seen as an attempt to resist the forces of globalisation, suppression and assimilation (Niezen, 2004). McIntosh (2005) argues that such unyielding criteria could be seen to support both the concerns and aspirations of Maori as well as progressing many political issues. Borrell (2005) instead contends that when cultural practices are used as criteria for authenticating ‘Maori identity’, only the cultural identity of some Maori are reflected and not others. The risk is that Maori who are not deeply or actively steeped in such recognised dimensions of Maori culture are often invisible. Their identity markers as Maori are misunderstood and as a result many are marginalised. McIntosh (2005) tells of a student who was refused preferential placement in a university programme because “though she looked the part she had only visited her marae as a very young child” (p.45). McIntosh comments that she is “saddened by criteria that test Maoriness on things that may well be out of the control of the individual...should someone who identifies as Maori be excluded due to familial or structural dynamics in which she may have little influence?” (p.45).

The participants experienced ‘feeling different’ in relation to many things - their hair, racially-coded standards of beauty, but also racially-coded ways of talking (Lewis, 2003). Language was not a neutral mode of communication but a way of telling people who they were, where they came from, whether they were in some way collectively different or whether they were ‘like us’ and therefore someone with whom they could easily relate. Not only is language racialised (certain ways of

talking in New Zealand are thought of as a Maori ‘accent’), language itself racialises because certain ways of talking or an accent can mark one as racially other (Lewis, 2003).

The ever-changing and oppressive contexts within which Maori live in New Zealand mean that attempts to modify traditional culture, and by association the criteria for authentic Maori identity, could be seen as a threat to community cohesion (Lee, 1996), and with good reason. Colonialism continues in the form of mainstream Pakeha culture and values being held up as normal, ordinary and desirable. This colonialism contributes to the ongoing constructions of a ‘real’ Maori identity based on traditional cultural phenomena, while Pakeha culture goes unnoticed and uncriticised. The nature of Pakeha cultural hegemony renders ‘normal’ or invisible Pakeha cultural values and practices. This is exacerbated by a tendency for most Western academics to focus on minority or marginal groups, rather than their own (Chambers, 1994). Pakeha popular culture is the default setting, the invisible option for culture and identity. Some contend that this invisibility is cultivated in order to maintain the power base that comes with it. There also exists a discourse of culture that proposes that ethnic cultures are diametrically opposed and mutually exclusive. This discourse continues to oppress and colonise minority peoples, portraying them always as other (Chambers & Curti, 1996; Keddell, 2006; Root, 1992). For mixed Maori/Pakeha in particular, this dichotomous and oppressive situation means that they have to negotiate their legitimate place in both groups.

The demand for legitimacy placed on people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent is complex. The struggles they face regarding the dictates of societal understandings of race and culture means that they often consciously act to reject them. Ramona is evidence of this when she states emphatically:

I own who I am and who I have determined myself to be. I am comfortable with this. I felt quite empowered by the fact that I’ve chosen to identify myself as Maori...I no longer care to know what anyone else thinks on the subject.

Alternatively, Nicola discusses her ability to ‘walk in both worlds’ and claims that she has found a comfortable place that straddles both:

The benefit for me is that I can walk in both worlds. I know that I can fit in at a Pakeha gig. I know the behaviours and how to act accordingly - to be accepted and to fit in and be well-received.

This ability to consciously choose who and how to be in a situation is termed the ‘new mestiza’ by Anzaldua (1987). She comments that mixed race individuals become conscientised to the racial paradigms which seek to exclude or marginalise them. The participants’ ability to ‘name themselves’ or self-identify shows an embracing of new narratives that allow one to actively and consciously choose to construct an identity that embraces aspects of both or all of their culture. This increasing freedom and desire to self-define relates to the liberalisation of values in many areas of the Western world, allowing more post-modern and diverse understandings and values (Katz, 1996; Statistics New Zealand, 2004; Tizard & Phoenix, 1993).

Media

The mass media have become a significant influence on the way ethnic groups come to see and relate to each other (MacPherson & Spoonley, 2004). The media plays a significant role in the selection, construction and management of ethnic images and the ethnic relationships that follow from them. Khylee’s comment is illustrative of the misrepresentation of Maori in the mass media,

I was watching the news when they picked up that suspect for the Berget Bauer murder inquiry. At the time TV3 and the Herald referred to him as “part-Maori - could pass as European”, and I was like, “pass - What is this? 1950’s Alabama?” Without having any idea of what he looked like I saw that description and thought, “hey, European, can’t you use the word Pakeha (there is always a political issue in the media about that), “caucasian, from the Caucasious mountains – not”. So the fact they use the term ‘European’ offended me and then the fact that, ‘he could pass ...’ like that was a positive thing. I thought, “Watch out, there are Maoris amongst you”. It’s hysterical. Then when I actually saw him in the news, well, I thought, ‘oh my gosh, that

man's as Maori as they come'. He looked like a Tuhoe bushman! Where is he passing? He certainly wouldn't be passing in Dunedin.

Maori voices are significantly disadvantaged in mainstream media coverage, which often functions to silence Maori, while relying on non-Maori voices to frame issues concerning Maori. Biases in depictions of inter-group relations in Aotearoa are not new but continue to have a significant impact on the ethnic development of Maori and mixed Maori/Pakeha. Print media too has played a central role in processes of colonisation, being used as a tool for convincing colonising and colonised groups that what is occurring was in the interests of 'everyone' (MacPherson & Spoonley, 2004).

Some mainstream representations of Maori in the mass media include: Maori culture is inherently inferior to that of the Pakeha; Good Maori/Bad Maori fall into two groups – those who fit in with society and those who do not; Maori (men especially) seek and enjoy violence; there are very few real Maori left; most part-Maori are more something else; Maori have special privileges which are unfair, racist and akin to Apartheid; if only the Maori people would stop stirring up trouble where none exists race relations in New Zealand would be the 'best-in-the-world' once more; Maori have become over-sensitive about their culture and this has led to racial tension; where Pakeha do offend Maori, they do so out of ignorance (McCreanor, 1993).

At its most basic, the media represent, misrepresent and perpetuate the myths of a culture and ethnic group. Many people in both dominant and minority ethnic groups become increasingly influenced by the media-generated images of 'themselves' and 'others'. This reality confers significant power on the controllers of mass media to define the ways that we come to know, understand and react to others in our culturally diverse societies. The over-representation of Maori as violent, degenerate and helpless has had a significant impact on the self-concept of the participants. Tucker (1990) would argue that this is marginalisation and is a potent force in identity formation. McIntosh (2005) believes that marginalisation is both a "process and experience" centred on power relations; as power shifts, any group can find itself ignored, trivialised, silenced, rendered invisible and made other (p.40).

Marginalisation was a potent force in the ethnic identity formation for all of the

participants. It was a socio-political process and experience that involved the peripheralisation of the participants from a dominant, more central majority. Marginalisation is inclusive of oppression but also a consequence of it (Hall, 1996). For Nicola, Khylee and Ramona, their marginality meant that they were located at the fringe of two dominant groups, periphery dwellers, living in a liminal space where stigmatisation and exclusion were part of lived reality (McIntosh, 2005).

The cultures influential in schools, universities and work

Though Maori students generally spend less time in the education system and do less well than non-Maori (Bishop, 2003; Bishop et al., 2001; 1999; Macfarlane, 2004), all the participants in this study were relatively successful academically. Three have studied to a post-graduate level and the other three to graduate level. One has completed a professional certificate. All work in professional environments including schools, a university, the police force and the corporate world. This section of the chapter will examine the participants' involvement in institutions like school and work and the influence of these institutions on their developing ethnic identity as adolescents and adults.

Each participant had a significant experience in the exo-system (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) in either school, university or work situations that could be viewed as an *encounter* (Cross, 1971). As previously discussed in the chapter investigating identity, Cross (1971) believes that a person's self-perception, worldview, ideologies and value systems change during 'Nigrescence'. Nigrescence is the process by which minority and bi-racial people come to understand the relevance of their race/ethnicity for their personal identity. The participants' *encounters* with racism at various institutions had a significant impact on their ethnic identity development.

School and university 'encounters'

Ramona discusses two key events that impacted her ethnic identity. In the first incident at primary school Ramona was given a label to describe to which ethnic group she belonged. She had never previously been taught that a label to describe her was even important.

It wasn't until I began school at the age of five that I was taught the connection between who I was with my whanau and what others called being a Maori. I didn't even know that I was Maori... I found out that I was Maori at school because that's what they told me I was.

A second incident occurred at university when she encountered primordial (fixed) identity criteria for authentication as Maori. This experience was a catalyst for establishing a more secure, self-defined ethnic identity. The result of this encounter was that she internalised her personal sense of Maori identity and began to challenge any racial and cultural oppression aimed at her. She comments:

Five years ago I was attending Waikato University and doing a degree in Social Science. I had a Maori paper called 'Maori and Pakeha in Contemporary New Zealand'. It was all about identity confusion. I was really embarking at that stage on a journey of self-discovery. I was looking for education (to provide a future for myself) and also looking at my personal identity. This paper talked a lot about what the key markers of Maori were. It talked about 'te reo' and 'tikanga' and 'Kaupapa Maori' and Maori myths and legends. Basically the lecturer was saying that he considered Maori-ness to be very connected to the 'reo' and a lot of the research underpinned his opinion. I had a lot that I could contribute to our people back home and I took offence because I don't speak te reo and had been kept from it. But I knew what it was to be involved in a Maori community. I knew what it was to be a part of your marae and to be involved physically in the activities of my community and marae and to have the heart. But the paper had negated all of this. As an assignment I had to write what I thought the identifying characteristics of a Maori were. I wrote that it was all about the heart, what we feel. I got a C- (laughs) for the assignment and when I went to see the lecturer about it he said that 'the research shows that this is not true' and I said 'I don't care what the research says, I am Maori and I identify as Maori. I don't speak te reo but I do have a heart for it'. He failed me and subsequently I dropped out. However, I defiantly felt at that point that I could confidently state that I was Maori. I had

to listen to my tupuna and whakapapa. Nobody was going to tell me what it was to be a Maori because that was for me to decide and my whanau.

Hailey-Jane found that her experience as a Maori student in a Maori-centred university programme enlightened her with regard to the struggles Maori have faced with language and culture loss. She was raised in a whanau-centred Maori community where te reo me ona tikanga Maori was an everyday way of life. She states:

Our family were quite lucky in that a lot of them never moved away from the iwi, from the hapu, so they were able to maintain the reo. Being brought up here and surrounded by that shapes the way that we think and the way that we interact with each other. We have got the tikanga and we've got te reo. We are proud to belong to this group and to say that we are Maori. I've never been in a situation where I've been whakama or shy of it. I've actually always been proud of being Maori, even when I was going to school. I was a minority and a lot of the other Maori kids were quite embarrassed to be Maori but I'm fortunate that I had strong whanau who were Maori and they really supported us in being brought up as Maori.

She was not aware that other Maori had not had the same opportunities to learn this cultural knowledge that is so important in forming a strong Maori identity. While participating in the 'Huarahi Maori' teacher education pathway she learnt that her exposure and immersion in Maoritanga was not necessarily a common experience. This was her encounter:

...when I was growing up I took it for granted that I was Maori. I didn't know any different but when I moved to Auckland and started learning about Kaupapa Maori I realised I hadn't been taught the preciousness of te reo. I didn't actually know all these things. I didn't know about language revitalization and the struggle that we've gone through. I didn't realize I was born into a decade in the 1980's where things were already changing. I didn't even know I was a part of that. The attitudes were already changing. So when I went there (Huarahi Maori) I became conscientised. I wanted to be a Maori teacher; I didn't know about the whole revitalization and how important it was

and things like that because we always had it. I'm from a place, luckily enough, where we haven't had to look at re-establishing our reo in our family because it has always been there. So it makes me realize how lucky we are and also how I can help other people. I realize that other people have this feeling of loss and often they haven't had Maoritanga, they haven't had te reo.

Matt's encounter happened while he was at university too. While coping with the stereotyping that came hand-in-hand with acquiring a Maori tattoo, he realised that this was an important time in terms of reasserting his pride in his identity as a Maori. He states:

At the end of my first undergrad year at university I got my moko. I got sick of people looking at me and saying, "oh yeah you're Samoan, you're Tongan" and I was like, "nah, I'm Maori". My whakaaro was "now you can't mistake who I am". It makes me feel different as well, even if it's covered, I'm still empowered. In a professional environment as a teacher I worry about perceptions, but the thing is, it's not the kids, it's the parents. It's an empowering experience to get it and to wear it with pride and to be able to show it if you want. I explain to the kids the cultural significance of it, especially the young Maori boys. I tell them clearly that it is not for fashion but I tell them the significance for me and how it links me back to the many generations of my tipuna. All parents see is the social stigma that is attached to it. It's harder to explain and overcome those perceptions than it is to explain the significance to a child. An underlying motivation for my moko was showing it. It is easy for me to share parts of my culture if people can see what I am and if I can bring who I am to the surface.

Workplace encounters

Unlike Ramona, Hailey-Jane, Khylee and Matt, Nicola and Brenda had *encounters* in their workplace. Both participants face daily stereotyping with regard to negative perceptions of Maori. Nicola comments:

My colleagues know that I'm Maori but that is because the job has bracketed me as being Maori. Those who don't know look at me and think, "She's not". They think they can get away with more, like they are not scared around me about political correctness and things Maori. Some mustn't know that I am Maori because sometimes when we sit at the table you can hear where the conversation is going; you know it because you've heard it for years. You can hear where it's going and you'll watch the cop who's saying it. He looks around the table and susses out if it is ok, "yeah, I'm amongst friends, no enemies here because we are all fair-skinned ". Then they will come out with it and it's because they thought that I was one of them.

Similarly Brenda comments:

Other people may have a work environment where there is a lot more support but in my professional life I come across people who really don't know anything about Maori issues apart from what they have seen on TV...that is the main problem that I've come up against.

From an analysis of the participants' narratives it became obvious that they encountered three forms of racism in their work and school situations. The first is personal racism, where an individual's negative stereotypes and attitudes towards other racial groups cause him or her to discriminate against those groups (Owusu & Howitt, 1994). The second form is institutionalised racism or structural racism, where the policies and practices of organisations deny members from an oppressed group access to resources and power. This can also be termed 'ethnocentrism' or 'cultural racism', where the values, beliefs and ideas that are embedded in social representations endorse the superiority of one group over the other (Owusu & Howitt, 1994). The third form of racism is internalised racism, which can be defined as acceptance of negative messages about our own abilities and intrinsic worth by members of the stigmatized races (Owusu & Howitt, 1994). Self-devaluation impacts on our health, education, career and general life chances.

The first level - personal racism - manifests itself as differential assumptions about the abilities, motives and intents of others, by race, and then differential actions based on those assumptions. This level of racism is what most people think of when they hear the word racism - the prejudice, the different idea, and then the discrimination, the different action. Like institutionalised racism, personal racism can be through acts of omission, not doing, as well as acts of commission, doing. And also very importantly, personal racism can be unintentional, as well as intentional. You do not need to have intended to do something racist for it to have a racist impact. Nicola and Brenda experienced both direct and indirect personal racism in their work environments.

The second level is institutionalised racism. This level can be defined as one that results in differential access to the goods, services and opportunities of society, by race (Owusu & Howitt, 1994). This is the kind of racism that often does not have an identifiable perpetrator; instead it is often manifested as inherited disadvantage. It is invisible because it is institutionalised in our laws, policies, customs, norms and value systems. Institutionalised racism manifests itself in terms of access to material conditions, like housing, education, employment, income, medical facilities and access to clean environments. Institutionalised racism also manifests in terms of access to power. Power is having access to information which could be education or information about your own history - access to power is dependant on material resources, organizational resources, political resources, or access to power as a voice, representation on school boards, representation in politics, representation on the media and control of the media. Through acts of omission, not doing, as well as acts of commission, doing, institutionalised racism very often manifests itself as inaction in the face of need. Nicola and Brenda have both felt powerless in work situations at their lack of 'voice' (Hirschman, 1970) in the workplace and ethnic misrepresentation in the media. Brenda comments when people have misrepresented Maori issues, she gets tired of "...feeling like you have to explain constantly to people who question or challenge you. You just get sick of it. You get fired up and angry".

The third level of racism is internalised racism. Feeling less than members of other groups is not only not good for the people involved but also limits their life

opportunities. Matt's low-self esteem and poor ethnic identity in childhood is a prime example of internalized racism. The school environment has long been acknowledged as a vehicle for reproducing social inequalities and reinforcing the primacy of white-middle-class culture (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). The educational experience for most of the participants was one where their ethnic identity remained personal and was not seen as relevant to the mainstream, predominantly Pakeha world of education. Their formal education instead involved the internalisation of institutional or institution-based knowledge or the acquisition of role-specific knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1991).

Schools are central places where notions of self are formed. Ethnic identities, both those assigned to children and those they choose, affect children's schooling experiences. This is because ethnicity is not a fixed characteristic that children bring to school with them and then take away unaffected and intact (Lewis, 2003). Ethnic identity and racial inequality (in terms of access to resources) are reproduced in day-to-day life at school. Schools and people are racialising agents that act as forces in the reproduction and transformation of race. Lewis (2003) asserts that "schools are arguably one of the central institutions involved in the drawing and redrawing of racial lines" (p.4). Although schools do not explicitly teach ethnic identity as they would maths or reading, schools are settings where people learn some version of the rules of racial classification and of their own ethnic identity (Omi & Winant, 1994). Lewis's (2003) research has found that not only does the curriculum (formal and hidden) teach many racial lessons, but schools and school personnel serve as a location of interaction and as a means of both affirming and challenging previous racial attitudes and understandings. Far from functioning as a great equaliser, schools too often perpetuate existing inequalities.

Although Brenda felt she had adequate positive exposure to Maori culture and traditions at school, the other participants felt their ethnic group had little significance to their everyday school lives.

Brenda's experiences in urban, largely middle-class schools were positive. She attended schools where her sense of Maori identity was supported and affirmed. She comments:

When I was at high school I didn't really want to study Maori as a subject through to seventh form, but that was one thing my mother did make me do and I'm glad she did. It gave me a lot of exposure to tikanga, things that you wouldn't do everyday. Otherwise I would have grown up like a white person.

When I was at Auckland Girls Grammar and Ponsonby Intermediate I was proud to be a Maori. I don't have a specific time I can remember that really made me think 'that's the group I want to identify myself with but just in general I think school instilled in me a sense of pride in being Maori...at high school when I did kapa haka and that, I was always proud of it and never felt ashamed.

Brenda feels that she has always been supported to be proud of her Maori identity. It must be noted that Brenda attributes her strong Maori identity to her Pakeha mother as opposed to her Maori father. She states:

My family, like my mum and also our extended family on her side (not relations but family and friends), have always been people who really promoted Maoritanga, the culture and the heritage. My dad is actually the Maori one but he didn't encourage me to acknowledge it at all.

Kukutai's (2005) research on the inter-generational transmission of minority ethnicity by mothers of New Zealand Maori/Pakeha children found that far from expressing bias toward their own ethnic group, Pakeha mothers tended to favour Maori ethnicity as an ethnic label for their children. Kukutai elaborates that because Pakeha mothers more often label their children as solely Maori, even if they are not personally equipped to transmit to them the substance of Maori identity, they play a significant role in transmitting Maori ethnicity across generations. This is true of Brenda's situation. Parents in racially-mixed households theoretically negotiate the landscape of racial identity, racial difference and perhaps racial discrimination differently than other families of colour. This may produce a different degree of investment on the part of parents as they provide their children with greater resources in the forms of

parental involvement in learning about the importance of their ethnic identity.

A distinguishing feature of the ethnically-mixed family is the complex identity development of its hybrid children and adolescents. In such a household, the ethnic identity of the child may follow a variety of paths - it may reflect the mother's ethnic background, the father's ethnic background, an identity that embraces both at once or rejects race all together (Rockquemore & Brunsma, 2002; Root, 1996). Parents represent direct and indirect influences on the identities of mixed race offspring. Indirectly, parents provide a context for their child's day-to-day interactions and the ethnic composition of their social networks through selecting their area of residence and schools they attend (Rockquemore and Brunsma, 2002). Both these components also reflect the parents' social class. Parents also directly influence their identity development by instilling a sense of ethnic belonging and providing their initial impressions of race. This may result in providing children with survival skills to navigate social stigmas of ethnic mixture and racism in general. Heard and Bratter's (2006) research found that parents who are explicitly racially different from their children have to work harder and invest more time in order to instill a sense of ethnic or racial belonging. They also comment that this can be seen to be compensatory for the ethnic ambiguity of the identities of the children.

Khylee discusses the invisibility of her ethnicity and its salience being downplayed, trivialised or challenged in school. She comments:

At seventeen I didn't overtly identify as Maori at school because there was no reason to. This sounds a bit silly but we didn't have a te reo teacher; you had to learn te reo through correspondence, which was a hassle. The attitude, both at home and school, was that te reo wasn't a particularly useful subject and because I was going to law school I didn't think it would be useful. I'm embarrassed to think of that now. There was no kapahaka. It was a big urban school but not a place on which being Maori was a good thing...there was no reason for me to overtly put my hand up to be Maori at school. I would never deny it. I was kind of living a dual life; I was really Maori at home and school was school. Then at the end of 6th form, I got the top 6th form grades for New Zealand for 6th form certificate and won the Ngarimu Maori scholarship worth

\$35,000. At that stage, even then, I sort of thought, ‘of course I am entitled to that, I’m Maori’. I had to go back to school to be presented with this scholarship before I went to University and the principal said to me, “I never knew you were Maori” and I thought, “you never asked!” And it made it really obvious to me that I hadn’t done anything to identify myself and I was quite embarrassed by that.

The invisibility of Maori curriculum in Khylee’s school served the purpose of quietly communicating to both her and other Maori students that Maori knowledge, language and cultural practices were not valued or legitimate in her formal education. This invisibility of Maori culture perpetuated the domination of the invisible majority culture. This is not uncommon. In fact, Bishop and Glynn (1999) state that many educational practitioners continue to ignore culture as a central ingredient in educational interactions. This meant that some of Khylee’s schooling experience lacked what Simon (1982) refers to as a positive, emotional dimension. The omission of Maori language, knowledge and cultural worldview signalled what and whose knowledge was a priority and of most value. This is one way in which schools both officially and unofficially reify Pakeha culture to be the ‘superior norm’. Khylee learnt, via symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), that only her Pakeha knowledge, values and culture were valid and legitimate.

Khylee’s principal and teachers demonstrated what could be considered ‘colour-blind’ teaching practice with regard to not acknowledging the significance of her dual ethnicity on her sense of self and ultimately her ethnic identity. Colour-blind racial attitudes include being unaware of racial dynamics, that is, believing that racism does not exist (Lewis, 2003). Such attitudes do not always imply racial superiority but can also mean just being unaware of the existence of racism. Color-blind racial attitudes have three components: unawareness of racial privileges (blindness to white privilege), institutional discrimination (limited unawareness of institutional forms of discrimination) and blatant racial issues (denial of general and pervasive racial discrimination) (Chao, 2005).

Some would say ‘we are what we know’ (Freire, 1985), but Pinar (1993) would add ‘we are also what we do not know’ (p.61). It is in this sense that school and its

curriculum can be considered racialised. Schooling involves the construction and reconstruction of knowledge that informs who we are. Khylee's schooling did not reflect her full identity. It only affirmed one half of her dual identity – Pakeha. So what does this mean in terms of the value she places on Maori language and culture? Two contrasting statements reflect the difficulty Khylee has in reconciling her lack of knowledge about her Pakeha heritage and her attempts to manage the expectations placed on her for authenticating her 'Maori-ness'. Khylee states:

In regards to dual identity, the assumption that you are Pakeha, unless otherwise labelled or requested, actually has a trickle down effect in my own life. I think, "why bother if you don't need to address that?" So I never have really thought about my one Pakeha grandparent because he's the norm...that is a constant source of guilt, worrying about whether or not you're doing the right thing - if you've got the balance.

Tertiary education appears to be a site where a number of the participants had an experience that served as a catalyst for exploring and articulating their ethnic identity. Their concept of identity and sense of self shifted as a result of both internal and external changes in this environment. For these individuals with dual ethnicity, their concept of identity had multiple shifting layers of meaning.

Social networks

As discussed earlier in this chapter, one's immediate social environment has a significant impact on ethnic identity development and belonging. Family can have the most crucial influence on the development of children's cognition. Through family, a child learns what is expected of them in society. They learn to distinguish right from wrong. In this cognitive process, children figure out how they fit into the world at large - they develop a sense of self. The atmosphere of the family interactions is what helps children deal with issues such as identity formation, building self-esteem, emotional perspectives and intellectual development. Some people assume mixed race children will grow up in a family consumed with conflict and that conflict will have a negative effect on their development (Park, 1928, 1931). On the other hand, this study

shows that although mixed race children may face conflict, as any child does, it is up to the family to provide the foundation for them to overcome these conflicts.

Noguera & Wing (2006) say that today parents assume one of three positions as to the identity of their mixed race children. Some insist that their child is 'human above all else' and that ethnicity is irrelevant, while others choose to raise their children with the identity of the parent of minority ethnicity. Another growing group of parents is insisting that the child have the ethnic, racial, cultural and genetic heritage of both parents (Noguera & Wing, 2006).

In identity formation, children seek to look, act, feel and be like significant people in their social environment. Erickson (1968) relates ego identity and self-esteem to ethnic identity. He believes that ambiguous messages about one's race may place a person at risk for developing what he referred to as a 'negative identity'. How a child is socialized within the family has a direct impact on the identity formation of inter-racial children and thus an effect on social cognition and self-efficacy. An individual's development is shaped and defined by the socio-cultural context of that individual's life. The environment in which parents choose to raise their children is influenced by their cultural beliefs and traditions. At the same time children must come to a cognitive understanding of their world. "This two-sided process, in which both the environment and the child are seen as active agents, is referred to as social co-construction" (Valsiner, 1988, cited in Cole and Cole, 1993, p.339). People in different cultures engage in different activities and have different beliefs about these activities. Parents expect their children to act appropriately. However, it does not stop there. "Adult evaluations are more than an external fact; they are the basis for children's self-evaluations" (Cole and Cole, 1993, p.369). Family is a critical factor in the foundation of a child's self-esteem and parents are the earliest and most powerful source of racial attitudes (positive or negative).

The participants' sense of ethnic identity have always reflected the views of those around them – particularly their parents, grandparents, friends, teachers and colleagues. In this way the ethnic identities they described were socially derived and constructed through interactions, both positive and negative, with others within their social networks. So when did the participants begin to self-define?

Finding ‘Voice’

For four of the six participants, tertiary education provided a vehicle by which their Maori identity became more salient and important. This occurred in two distinct ways. They became more involved with other Maori at university and, through positive socialisation, came to accept and value being Maori. Alternatively, they may have gained insight into the structural antecedents of Maori social problems and began to attribute these factors external to Maori control rather than Maori inability to ‘cope’ with Pakeha society (Houkamau, 2006). These experiences helped them to evaluate their Maori identities more positively and find a voice for articulating and self-defining their ethnic identity.

Hirschman’s (1970) ‘exit-voice’ distinction can be used to analyse the ways Maori *resist* having to legitimise their claim to Maori ethnicity. Hirschman’s theory details alternative forms of response to dissatisfaction or discontent with organisations or groups of which people are members (Dale and Ozga, 1993). ‘Exit’ is a response that involves withdrawal from the group. This can occur not only physically but can be mental (in a ‘who cares?’ attitude) as well. This is a very individualistic, resistant response. It is impersonal – any face-to-face confrontation between individual and group is avoided. Matt chose to exit from acknowledging his Maori ancestry whilst at school. He found exiting the most satisfactory way to overcome the bullying he encountered because of his Maori heritage at secondary school. Ramona, too, exited university when she felt dissatisfied with the course content of her Maori identity paper. Their response was the easiest and quickest response to the personal and institutional racism they encountered.

Resistance using voice attempts to reduce the dissatisfaction by complaint, criticism or suggestion and is considered by Dale and Ozga (1993) to be a “participatory, political response” (p.76). In all respects, voice is just the opposite of exit. It is a far more messy concept because it can be graduated, all the way from faint grumbling to violent protest. It implies articulation of one’s critical opinions and is direct and straightforward rather than roundabout. Voice is political action par excellence (Hirschman, 1970). Voice can be described as *horizontal*, which implies passive

complaint that is ineffective, or *vertical*, which is effective and used to suggest action at a higher level (Hirschman, 1970). All the participants found their voice at some stage in their early adulthood. It helped them to resist being authenticated and defined by others and to construct and articulate a more fluid, comfortable and most importantly, self-defined ethnic identity.

Naming self

The popular maxim in educational circles, derived from Paulo Freire's work (1987, p.70) "name the word, name the world" points to the inherent power embedded in language. The power to name and define for one's self is not only central in the ability to construct and organise one's experiences, but also provides a fundamental dimension of human agency and social transformation (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

Brenda uses bloodline/ancestry as simple justification of her ethnic group choice when she states:

I am Maori because my father is Maori. Growing up I always preferred to identify myself as that. I feel as though I look more Maori than Pakeha.

Hailey-Jane on the other hand talks about her choice regarding being Maori as non-negotiable, due to the influence of her Maori whanau:

Identifying as Maori has a lot to do with how I was brought up. I've always thought of myself as Maori. I think it's been the huge influence that my Maori whanau has played in my life. Even though I've had influences from my Pakeha whanau as well I felt that I was more connected and more comfortable just identifying as Maori.

Similarly, Ramona identifies whanau as a key factor in self-determining her ethnic identity:

I identify myself in relation to those who have had the greatest influence in my life - those who have shaped my values and ideals, including my whanau and most significantly my mother.

Alternatively, Nicola's ethnic self-label of 'Maori/Pakeha' is influenced by external factors, such as her appearance:

I identify as Maori/Pakeha because I don't feel that I'm qualified to say that I'm specifically Maori...I guess my problem lies in the way I look. That 'Maori' package doesn't fit me. I don't fit into that stereotypical Maori mould.

This range of factors with regard to self-identifying ethnicity is a good indication of the complex nature of ethnic identity. These responses signal a variety of influences on the participants' ethnic identity development, ranging from the construction of ethnicity as essentially a descent based reification, to a definition of ethnicity that encompasses cultural practices and values and the attributed group membership. These changes in defining ethnicity are also congruent with a global move to individualistic, human-rights' ideology that includes the right of people to self-define their ethnic identity, including being able to claim more than one (Niezen, 2004). These changes recognise that ethnicity is socially constructed, situational, unstable and fluid.

The responses of the participants regarding their ethnic identity demonstrates their subjective understanding of themselves as racialised people and the recognition that they are both *similar to* and *different from* other people (Omi & Winant, 1994). Thus ethnic identities are consciously derived from recognizing a distinction between oneself and other people. This consciousness gives birth to an identity shift that is more fulfilling and gratifying and produces self-esteem and growth. This identity shift is termed 'identity reclamation' by Edwards (1999) and is a tacit project to renew a cultural history on the participants' own terms.

On the whole there were two separate responses to my request for the participants to name their ethnic identity: (1) "I consider myself mixed Maori/Pakeha (both Maori and Pakeha)" and (2) "I know I am mixed Maori/Pakeha but I experience the world as

Maori”. Both of these responses represent individuals who understand their own ethnic identity as mixed Maori/Pakeha. They differ, however, because the first response indicates that others in the person’s social network accept and *validate* ‘half-caste’ as a legitimate category of ethnic identity. The second response reveals a more complicated scenario in which the respondents understand themselves as mixed, but their self-understanding is rejected by others who do not consider ‘mixed’ a legitimate ethnic identity.

Maintaining borders, building bridges

As discussed in chapter four, early models of hybrid identity development (Park, 1928; Stonequist, 1937) were stage-based and modernist in orientation, but more recent theories take a post-modern approach. Hybridised ethnicity is now seen as positive (Weisman, 1996) because it allows the hybrid individual to engage in a variety of border crossings (Giroux, 1992) between and among social contexts defined by race and ethnicity. Root (1996) proposes a theory of identity formation that does not depend on an orderly progression through developmental stages but which relies rather on an individual’s ability to be comfortable with self-definition in, across, and/or between categories. Root’s (1996) model of healthy bi-racial identity development describes how an individual resolves other status through one of four border crossings. She identified these border crossers as (a) having “*both feet in both groups*” (p.xxi; emphasis hers) or being able to hold and merge multiple perspectives simultaneously; (b) choosing situational ethnicity and race or consciously shifting racial foreground and background in different settings; (c) deciding to sit on the border, claiming a multi-racial, central reference point; and (d) creating a home-base in one identity and making forays into others.

All these options infer ‘between-ness’ or mobility. Nicola, the sole participant to identify as Maori/Pakeha, was the only one who commented on being mobile between the two ethnic groups. She stated that she was comfortable in the interface. Nicola comments:

I wouldn’t change it I don’t think. I wouldn’t want to be any darker. I know that Sha, who I work with, is always dealt with as a Maori and she doesn’t

have the luxury that I do - being able to be seen as both...the benefit for me is that I can walk in both worlds. I know that I can fit in at a Pakeha gig. I know the behaviours and how to act accordingly - to be accepted and to fit in and be well received.

In summary, ethnic identification is not merely an individual achievement but is formed in relation to collective identities within racialised societies. These identities are products of social and political struggle and this struggle is heightened for a person of dual ethnicity. Our ethnic identity is about who we are, what we do, how we interact. It shapes where we live, with whom we interact, how we understand ourselves and others and it does so in specific ways, based on our social and historical location. For hybrid Maori/Pakeha this situation is doubly difficult because they must negotiate these complexities in three contexts; in a Maori context; in a Pakeha context; and in a context with other hybrid Maori/Pakeha. Therefore ethnic identity formation for hybrid Maori/Pakeha is fluid, multiple, relational, socially constructed and cyclic. How these participants came to understand their world and their place in it affected how they operate and thus shape the world in which they live.

Chapter 10
He korero whakamutunga

Conclusion

This study set out to explore the ways in which people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent construct and articulate ethnic identities that reflect their dual heritage. It aimed to provide insights and understandings about the challenges, issues and benefits associated with being of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent, by exploring the overlap of genetic, cultural and social influences on ethnic identity development.

The process of developing a positive ethnic identity was complex for the participants. Factors unique to their dual heritage influenced the process of constructing and articulating a positive ethnic identity that was inclusive of all aspects of their heritage. Through participation in higher education, all the participants came to better understand the forces that shaped their ethnic identity development. They were able to articulate the influence that their families played in shaping their ethnic identity, largely providing a sense of inclusion in the Maori ethnic group and exclusion from the Pakeha ethnic group. They also discussed how participation in an education system predicated on the superiority of Pakeha knowledge, values and beliefs negatively influenced their developing ethnic identity. It also became evident that the socio-political and historical misrepresentation of Maori, that is stereotyping, had a significant impact on the development of a positive Maori identity. The last factor that influenced the process of constructing and articulating a positive ethnic identity was their eventual desire to self-select an ethnic identity that represented their own attitudes to their hybridity.

Central to the process of developing a sense of belonging to both ethnic groups were the participants' experiences of marginalisation. It is evident that marginality was a key factor in all of the participants' ethnic identity development, in both Maori and Pakeha contexts. The participants experienced 'life on the edge' (McIntosh, 2005), located on the fringes of the Maori and Pakeha ethnic groups. This suggests that a key requirement for positive ethnic identity is the extent to which people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent experience a sense of belonging and acceptance among others.

Of course, their experiences with marginality need to be seen as existing on a continuum, but nevertheless they all had experiences where stigmatisation and exclusion were part of their lived reality.

The participants have used their experiences as marginal people to help reconceptualise their self-concept as Maori in two discrete ways. First, the participants have chosen to capture and politicise their marginality. They have chosen to use their experiences of exclusion and/or peripheralisation as a site of resistance. They use their marginal status to challenge the essentialised conceptions of ethnicity that have created insider/outsider boundaries. Secondly, the participants have sought to redefine their hybridity in their own terms, attempting to position themselves socially in a third space that allows them to occupy a unique ethnic identity.

Occupation of a third space has allowed the participants to self-define in two distinct ways. Matt and Hailey-Jane have chosen to self-define as Maori solely and they do not attempt to claim a bi-racial reference point. Alternatively Nicola, Ramona, Khylee and Brenda have chosen to engage in a variety of 'border crossings' between and among Maori and Pakeha social contexts (Root, 1996). These participants' ethnic identity celebrates their ability to be comfortable with self-definition in, across, and/or between Maori and Pakeha categories. They have chosen to resolve their 'other' status through a number of border crossings. Their situational ethnic identity means that at different times they can have "*both* feet in *both* groups" (Root, 1996 p.xxi; emphasis hers), or be able to hold and merge multiple perspectives simultaneously. Likewise, they may choose to shift their ethnic foreground and background in different settings, decide to sit on the border - claiming a bi-racial reference point - or create a home-base in one identity and make forays into others. They assert that this is their choice, not a choice that should be made for them. It seems that these participants are content "to live in limbo" (Park, 1928, p.881), forever negotiating their place, position and right to be a part of both ethnic groups. What has become evident is the need to be sensitive to the way articulations regarding ethnic group membership can exclude individuals of mixed descent. A key factor in the lives of hybrid Maori/Pakeha is how they are labelled, by themselves, their families and society in general.

Although this study is small and has limitations, I believe the findings help us to re-conceptualise how we view Maori, Pakeha and hybrid Maori/Pakeha identities in Aotearoa, New Zealand. As a starting point, it seems clear that the definitions regarding ethnic group membership need to be expanded to incorporate the individuality of those who have adapted positive identities to reflect their ethnicity, experiences, characteristics and social-cultural contexts. In being given further opportunities to construct and articulate their dual ethnicity, hybrid Maori/Pakeha may satisfy their own need for continuity, self-esteem and distinctiveness. Hence, this study argues that attaining a positive dual Maori/Pakeha ethnic identity is an achievement which is poorly understood, under-recognised and undervalued in New Zealand society. We need to discourage hybrid Maori/Pakeha seeing themselves as disaffiliated and inauthentic and instead place more emphasis on encouraging them to construct and articulate unique ethnic identities that are vibrant, unique and fluid.

Discussion in this conclusion so far suggests that a key requirement for a positive hybrid identity is the degree to which people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent experience a sense of belonging and acceptance amongst others. True inclusion allows hybrid Maori/Pakeha to live in both ‘Maori-ness’ and ‘Pakeha-ness’ in relation to their social interactions, relationships and cultural practices. However, this study also acknowledges the reality of the borderlands – the fact that many people have the right to belong on both sides of the ethnic boundary, or if preferred, occupy a third space in between. They can be “celebrated and privileged as a kind of superior cultural intelligence owing to the advantage of their in-between-ness, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference” (Hoogvelt, 1997 p.158).

The findings of this study reinforce the notion that the school environment is a vehicle for reinforcing the primacy of white middle class culture (Bordieu, 1977). In Aotearoa, this dynamic impacts on people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent because of multiple conflicting expectations put upon them. Hybrid Maori/Pakeha are expected by their families to achieve well at school (to ensure success in the Pakeha world), learn and use the implicit Pakeha values (to help them to straddle both worlds) and retain a strong Maori cultural identity (to remain authentically Maori). Exacerbating the impact of these multiple expectations on ethnic identity development are the

multiple forms of racism they experience in schools including: Pakeha (or other) racism towards them as Maori; Maori racism towards them as (perceived) Pakeha; and the suspicion or distrust of both groups towards them as hybrid Maori/Pakeha. These attitudes tended to be based on the appearance of the individuals, or superficial blood quantum biological assessments. It seems that primordial, 'race' based ethnic markers still predominate in schools in terms of ethnic classification.

For five of the six participants, school was a context that did not support the assertion or development of a mixed Maori/Pakeha ethnic identity. Despite this, all of the participants were relatively advantaged and successful academically at school. They are characterised by high levels of achievement and success in their chosen fields of endeavour, and high levels of self-determination (*tino rangatiratanga*). Their successful participation in the economy of mainstream society was facilitated by their self-motivation, management of multiple identities, and achievement in the education system. Through perseverance, establishing and maintaining Maori, Pakeha, and Maori/Pakeha social networks, and eventual self-validation, most participants achieved a level of comfort and familiarity with both cultures. These participants were also fortunate to have access to *whanaungatanga* and cultural resources. Not all people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent will have as many opportunities to express their hybridity.

In terms of intervention, it is important to keep in mind that school experiences are central to shaping ethnic identity. Positive hybrid role models, who model and express favourable ideas about being both Maori and Pakeha, are important for young people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent. Although this seems obvious for all ethnic groups, having close relationships with people who endorse being Maori may be of extra importance for hybrid Maori/Pakeha as they need help 'filtering out' negative stereotypes perpetuated by the dominant cultures. A specific intervention for schools may be to equip teachers with techniques that help young people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent to establish belonging to multiple ethnic groups, on multiple levels. Teachers need to teach their students positive ideas about ethnic identity as well as specific skills and strategies for understanding and dealing with discrimination or evaluating it objectively, should it be encountered. Such interventions may involve helping young people of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent to construct and articulate

positive dual identities. It is also important that students understand that ethnic identities do not have to remain fixed in the past, but can undergo constant transformation. People of mixed Maori/Pakeha descent can be culturally distinctive and loyal to the Maori ethnic group, but also be members of the broader national and international communities.

Further research could focus on identifying what kinds of people exemplify this hybrid Maori/Pakeha identity form. Possible research questions may include,

1. Among hybrid Maori/Pakeha, who has achieved a strong position in the Pakeha world while maintaining integrity as Maori?
2. What kinds of characteristics and social skills do these high achieving, culturally competent Maori/Pakeha have?

A better understanding of how some hybrid Maori/Pakeha typify this identity form and how they find an affinity between Maori and non-Maori viewpoints may shed some light, not only on how Maori may move forward as a people, but also how New Zealand's wider social fabric is continually transforming.

Reference List

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1991). Writing against culture. In R. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present*. Sante Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Anastas, J. (1999). *Research design for social work and human services*: Columbia University Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: The new mestiza = La frontera* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge and Paul.
- Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Atkinson, R. (1998). *The life story interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bakhtin, M. M., & Holquist, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ballara, A. (1998). *Iwi: The dynamics of Maori tribal organisation from c.1769 to c.1945*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga whakaaro :Key concepts in Maori culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, A. (2002). Social justice theory and practice: Pakeha, kaupapa Maori and educational leadership. *Social Justice Theory and Practice*, 1, 1-16.
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Barton, C. (2005). It's history, but not as we know it. *NZ Herald*, p. unknown.
- Baumeister, R. (1991). *The meaning of life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Beaglehole, E., & Beaglehole, P. (1946). *Some modern Maoris*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

- Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise reformed: A history of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the year 2000*. Auckland: Penguin Press.
- Bell, A. (2004a). 'Cultural vandalism' and Pakeha politics of guilt and responsibility. In P. Spoonley, D. G. Pearson & C. Macpherson (Eds.), *Tangata, tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank, Vic: Thomson.
- Bell, A. (2004b). 'Half-castes' and 'White Natives': The politics of Maori-Pakeha hybrid identities. In C. Bell & S. Matthewman (Eds.). *Cultural Studies in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Bentley, T. (1999). *Pakeha Maori: The extraordinary story of the Europeans who lived as Maori in early New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bergin, B. J. (2000). *Bicultural conversations: A study of identity in a group of Maori university students and implications for the counselling process*. Unpublished Master of Education, University of Auckland.
- Bertaux, D. (1981). *Biography and society: The life history approach in the social sciences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bevan, K. (2000). *Exploring personal and political issues of identity for white Maori women: Whakatoro to torangapu me te ake o nga kaupapa tuakiri mo nga wahine Maori ma*. Unpublished Master of Philosophy, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2003). *The cultural self-review: Providing culturally effective, inclusive, education for Maori learners*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). Frontlines/Borderposts. In A. Bammer (Ed.), *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question* (Vol. 15). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (2003). *Te kotahitanga : The experiences of year 9 and 10 Maori students in mainstream classrooms*. Wellington: Ministry of Education Research Division.

- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Richardson, C. (2001). *Te toi huarewa: Effective teaching and learning strategies, and effective teaching materials for improving the reading and writing in te reo Maori of students aged five to nine in Maori-medium education: Final report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education Research Division.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Borrell, B. (2005). Living in the city aint so bad: Cultural identity for young Maori in South Auckland. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Broughton, J. (1993). Being Maori. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 106 (968), 506 - 508.
- Brown, P. (1984). Official ethnic statistics in New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, D. Pearson & C. Sedgwick (Eds.), *Tauitiwi: Racism and ethnicity in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Brown, P. (1990). Biracial identity and social marginality. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 7(4), 319 - 337.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Butterworth, G. V., & Mako, C. N. (1989). *Te hurihanga o te ao Maori: Te ahua o te iwi Maori kua whakatatautia*. Wellington: Dept. of Maori Affairs.
- Caglar, A. (1997). Hyphenated identities and the limits of "culture". In T. Modood. & P. Werbner. (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, identity and community*. New York: Zed Books.
- Callister, P. (2004). Ethnicity measures, intermarriage and social policy. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 23, 109 - 140.

- Cuellar, I., Nyberg, B., Maldonado, R., Roberts, R. (1997). Ethnic identity and acculturation in a young adult Mexican-origin population. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 25 (6), 535 – 549.
- Chambers, I. (1994). *Migrancy, culture, identity*. London: Routledge.
- Chambers, I., & Curti, L. (1996). *The post-colonial question: Common skies, divided horizons*. New York: Routledge.
- Chao, R. (2005). *Counselors' Multicultural Competencies: From Gender and Ethnicity Perspectives*. University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Chapple, S. (2000). Maori socio-economic disparity. *Political science*, 52(2), 101 - 115.
- Clothier, H. (1993). *Three Maori women speak: A site for constituting identity*. Wellington: He Parekereke.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Collins, H. M. (1999). Nga tangata awarua: the joys and pain of being both Maori and Pakeha. *N.O.H.A.N.Z. Journal*, 1(5). 33-39.
- Collins, H. M. (2004). *Te Putahitanga o nga tai e rua*. Unpublished Master of Philosophy, Massey University, Wellington.
- Colquhoun, G. (1999). *The art of walking upright*. Wellington: Steele Roberts.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (5), 2-14.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cross, W. (1978). The Thomas and Cross “Models of Psychological Nigrescence: A Literature Review. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 5, 13-31.
- Cross, W. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African American Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, 20, 13-27.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research : meaning and perspective in the research process*. St Leonards, NSW: Sage.
- Cuellar, I., Nyberg, B., Maldonado, R., & Roberts, R. (1997). Ethnic identity and acculturation in a young adult Mexican-origin population. *Journal of Community Psychology* (25), 535-549.

- Dale, R., & Ozga, J. (1993). Two hemispheres - Both 'New Right'? : 1980s education reform in New Zealand and England and Wales. In B.Lingard, J.Knight & P.Paye (Eds.), *Schooling reforms in hard times* (pp. 63-87). London: Falmer Press.
- Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis: A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. New York: Routledge.
- Didham, R. A., Boddington, B., & Khawaja, M. A. (2004). *Fertility of New Zealand women by ethnicity: Based on New Zealand 1996 Census of Population and Dwellings*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Durie, M. (1995). *Nga Matatini Maori, Diverse Maori Realities*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kawanatanga: The politics of Maori self-determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, S. (1999). *Hokia ki nga maunga kia purea koe e nga hau o Tawhirimatea. Maori cultural identity reclamation: Empowerment through identity*. Unpublished Master of Education, University of Auckland.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis* ([1st] ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: Norton.
- Fine, M. (1997). Witnessing Whiteness. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off-White: Readings on Race, Power, and Society*. New York: Routledge.
- Fordham, S. (1996). *Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Ethnic identity, Identity, and Success at Capital High*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. London: Macmillan.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word & the world*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Geertz, C. (1963). The integrative revolution: primordial sentiments and civil politics in the new states. In C.Geertz (Ed.), *Old societies and new states*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Giddens, A. (1997). *Sociology* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A., Duneier, M., & Appelbaum, R. P. (2006). *Essentials of sociology*. New York: Norton.

- Gilborn, D. (1990). 'Race' ethnicity and education. In *Teaching and learning in a multi-ethnic school*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53(3), 261- 293
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. London: Routledge.
- Glazer, N., Moynihan, D. P., & Schelling, C. S. (1975). *Ethnicity: Theory and experience*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Grieshaber, S., & Canella, G. S. (2001). From identity to identities: Increasing possibilities in early childhood education. In S. Grieshaber & G. Canella (Eds.). *Embracing identities in early childhood education: Diversity and possibilities* (pp. 3-22). New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Hall, C. (1992). Please choose one: Ethnic identity choices for biracial individuals. In M. M. P. E. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America*. London: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1996). Cultural identity and diaspora. In P. Mongia (Ed.). *Contemporary postcolonial theory*. London: Arnold.
- Hall, S., & Du Gay, P. (1996). *Questions of cultural identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammersley, M. (1993). *Educational research: Current issues*. London: P. Chapman Pub.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography, principles in practice*. London : Tavistock.
- Harris, H. W., Blue, H. C., & Griffith, E. E. H. (1995). *Racial and ethnic identity: Psychological development and creative expression*. New York: Routledge
- Hawkins, J. M. (1983). *The Oxford paperback dictionary* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heard, H., & Bratter, J. (2006). *Racial and Ethnic Differences In Parent-Child Relationships: Does Mixed Race Matter?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Princeton University.
- Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial identity as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. Sodowsky & J. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 285-311). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.
- Herring, R. (1992). Biracial children: An increasing concern for elementary and middle school counselors. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 27(2), 123-130.

- Herring, R. (1995). Developing biracial ethnic identity: A review of the increasing dilemma. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 23, 29-38.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Houkamau, C. A. (2006). *Identity and socio-historical context: Transformations and change among Maori women*. Unpublished Doctorate of Philosophy in Psychology, University of Auckland.
- Hughes, M., & Hertel, B. (1990). The significance of color remains: A study of life chances, mate selection and ethnic consciousness among black Americans. *Social Forces*, 68(4), 1105-1120.
- Ichheiser, G. (1970). *Appearances and realities* ([1st] ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ihimaera, W. T. (1998). *Growing up Maori*. Auckland, N.Z.: Tandem Press.
- Isajiw, W. (1993). *Definition and dimensions of ethnicity: A theoretical framework*. Paper presented at the Challenges of measuring an ethnic world: Proceedings of the joint Canada-United States conference on the measurement of ethnicity, Washington DC.
- Jackson, M. (2003). The part-Maori syndrome. *Mana*, 52(June-July), 62.
- Johnston, P. M. G. (1998). *He ao rereke: Education policy and Maori under-achievement : mechanisms of power and difference*. Doctor of Philosophy in Education, University of Auckland.
- Karetu, T. (1990). The clue to identity. *National Geographic*, 5(Jan), 112 - 117.
- Katz, I. (1996). *The construction of racial identity in children of mixed parentage: Mixed metaphors*. London: J. Kingsley Publishers.
- Keddell, E. (2006). Pavlova and pineapple pie: Selected identity influences on Samoan-Pakeha people in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, 1, 45-63.
- Kerwin, C., Ponterotto, J. G., Jackson, B. L., & Harris, A. (1993). Racial identity in biracial children: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40(2), 221-231.
- Khawaja, M., Boddington, B., & Didham, R. (2000). *Growing ethnic diversity in New Zealand and its implications for measuring differentials in fertility and mortality*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- King, M. (1991). *Pakeha: The quest for identity in New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin.

- Kitzenger, C. (1989). Liberal humanism as an ideology of social control: The regulation of lesbian identities. In J. Shotter & K. J. Bergen (Eds.), *Texts of identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Krebs, P. M. (1999). *Gender, race, and the writing of empire public discourse and the Boer War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kukutai, T. (2001). *Maori identity and "political arithmetick": The dynamics of reporting ethnicity*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Waikato University, Hamilton.
- Kukutai, T. (2003). *The dynamics of ethnicity reporting: Maori in New Zealand. A discussion paper prepared for Te Puni Kokiri*. Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Kukutai, T. (2004). The problem of defining an ethnic group for public policy: Who is Maori and why does it matter? *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* (23), 86 - 108.
- Kukutai, T. (2005). *Understanding the intergenerational transmission of minority ethnicity: How mothers in New Zealand label their Maori/European children*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Lee, C., Spencer, M. B., & Harpalani, V. (2003). Every shut eye ain't asleep: Studying how people live culturally. *Educational Leadership Journal*, 32(5), 6-13.
- Lee, J. (1996). *He Hainamana toku mama, he Maori toku papa, ko wai ahau?: Maori-Chinese tell their stories : an exploration of identity*. Master of Education, University of Auckland.
- Lewis, A. E. (2003). *Race in the schoolyard: Negotiating the color line in classrooms and communities*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lindlof, T. (1991). The qualitative study of media audiences. *Journal of broadcasting and electronic media*, 35, 23-42.
- Liu, J., McCreanor, T., McIntosh, T., & Teaiwa, T. (Eds.). (2005). *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Macfarlane, A. H. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra: Listen to culture: Maori students' plea to educators*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- MacPherson, C., & Spoonley, P. (2004). Mediated ethnicity: media and the management of ethnic images in Aotearoa. In P. Spoonley, B. Pearson & C. MacPherson (Eds.), *Tangata, Tangata*. Southbank, Vic: Thomson.

- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, G. (1998). *A dictionary of sociology* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mason, P. L. (2001). Annual income and identity formation among persons of Mexican descent. *American Economic Review*, 2(91), 178 - 183.
- Matahaere, D. (1995). Maori, the 'eternally compromised noun': complicity, contradictions, and postcolonial identities in the age of biculturalism. *Women's Studies Journal*, 11(1-2), 15 - 24.
- McAdams, D. (1994). *The stories we live by: Personal myths and the making of the self*. New York: William Morrow.
- McCarthy, C. (2005). *Race, identity, and representation in education* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- McCreanor, T. (1993). Mimiwhangata: Media reliance on Pakeha commonsense in interpretations of Maori actions. *Sites*, 26, 79-90.
- McDonald, G. (1975). The categories "Maori" and "Pakeha" as defined by research workers and by self-report. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*(11), 37 - 49.
- McIntosh, T. (2005). Maori identities: Fixed, fluid, forced. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- McLaren, P., & Giarelli, J. M. (1995). *Critical theory and educational research*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McQueen, D. (1998). *Television: A media student's guide*. New York: Arnold.
- McRoy, R., & Freeman, E. (1986). Identity issues among mixed race children. *Social Work in Education*(8), 164-174.
- Mead, S. M. (2003). *Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori values*. Wellington: Huia.
- Meredith, P. (1999). "Being half-caste: Cultural schizo or cultural lubricant?" *Tu Mai*, (4 July 1999), 24.
- Meredith, P. (1999). Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *He Pukenga Korero*, 4(2), 12 - 16.
- Meredith, P. (2004). *A half-caste on the half-caste in the cultural politics of New Zealand*. Unpublished Doctorate of Philosophy.

- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Metge, J. (1964). *A new Maori migration: Rural and urban relations in Northern New Zealand*. London: Athlone Press.
- Middleton, S., & Jones, A. (1992). *Women and education in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Modell, A. H. (1993). *The private self*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Modood, T., Beishon, S., & Satnam, V. (1994). *Changing ethnic identities*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Morland, J., & Hwang, C. (1981). Racial/Ethnic identity of preschool children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 12(4), 409-424.
- Nasir, N., & Saxe, G. (2003). Ethnic and academic identities: A cultural practice perspective on emerging tensions and their management in the lives of minority students. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 14-18.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Newman, P., & Newman, B. (1999). What does it take to have a positive impact on minority students' college retention? *Adolescence*, 34(135), 483-492.
- Ngata, A. T. (1931). *Native land development*. Wellington: Govt. Printer
- Ngata, A. T., Buck, P. H., & Sorrenson, M. P. K. (1986). *Na to hoa aroha = From your dear friend: The correspondence between Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck, 1925-50*. Auckland: Auckland University Press in association with the Alexander Turnbull Library Endowment Trust and the Maori Purposes Fund Board.
- Niezen, R. (2004). *A world beyond difference: Cultural identity in an age of globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell publishing.
- Noguera, P., & Wing, J. Y. (2006). *Unfinished business: Closing the racial achievement gap in our schools* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- O'Regan, H. M. (2001). *Ko Tahu, ko au: Kai Tahu tribal identity*. Christchurch: Horomaka Publishing.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

- Ogbu, J. U. (2003). *Black American students in an affluent suburb : a study of academic disengagement*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant Students in Our Public Schools*. New York: New Press.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Owusu, J. & Howitt, D. (1994). *The racism of psychology: Time for a change*. London: Harvester and Wheatsheaf.
- Owusu-Bempah, J. (1994). Race, self-identity and social work. *British Journal of Social Work*, (24), 123-136.
- Owusu-Bempah, J. (1997). Race: A framework for social work? In M. E. Davies (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to social work*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Park, R. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology*, (33), 881-893.
- Park, R. (1931). The mentality of racial hybrids. *American Journal of Sociology* (36), 534-551.
- Parker, D., & Song, M. (2001). *Rethinking "mixed race"*. London: Pluto Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pere, R. (1988). Te wheke: Whaia te maramatanga me te aroha. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *Women and education in Aotearoa*. (pp.6-19). Wellington: Allen and Unwin Inc.
- Phinney, J. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 9, 34-49.
- Phinney, J. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin* (108), 499-514.
- Phinney, J. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. Chun, P. B. Organista & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63-81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Phinney, J., & Alipuria, L. (1996). At the interface of cultures: Multiethnic/multiracial high school and college students. *Journal of Social Psychology* (136), 139-158.

- Pinar, L. (1993). White is a colour: White defensiveness, postmodernism, and anti-racist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Pool, I. (1991). *Te iwi Maori*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Poston, W. (1990). The biracial identity development model: A needed addition. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69(2), 152-155.
- Potter, W. J. (1996). *An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative methods*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Powick, K. (2003). *Maori research ethics*. University of Waikato: Maori Education Research Institute.
- Rangihau, J. (1975). Being Maori. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: The world moves on*. (pp. 232-233). Wellington: Hicks Smith
- Rata, E. (1996). *Global capitalism and the revival of ethnic traditionalism in New Zealand: The emergence of tribal-capitalism*. Doctorate of Philosophy in Education, University of Auckland.
- Rata, E. (2005). Rethinking biculturalism. *Anthropological theory*, 5(3), 267-284.
- Rata, E., & Openshaw, R. (2006). *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ritchie, J. (1963). *The making of a Maori*. Wellington: A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- Rizvi, F. (1993). Children and the grammar of popular racism. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Rockquemore, K., & Brunsma, D. L. (2002). *Beyond Black: Biracial identity in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roosens, E. (1989). *Creating ethnicity: The process of ethnogenesis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Root, M. P. P. (1992). *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Root, M. P. P. (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rubie-Davies, C., Hattie, J., & Hamilton, R. (2006). Expecting the best for students: Teacher expectations and academic outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(3), 429-444.
- Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Salmond, A. (1991). *Two worlds: First meetings between Maori and Europeans, 1642-1772*. Auckland: Viking.
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social research* (3rd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sedikides, C., & Brewer, M. B. (2001). *Individual self, relational self, collective self*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Simon, J. A. (1982). *Policy, ideology and practice: Implications of the views of primary school teachers of Maori children*. Unpublished Master of Education, University of Auckland.
- Smith, E. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 181-188.
- Smith, G. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Maori: Theory and praxis*. Doctorate of Philosophy, University of Auckland.
- Smith, G. (1999). Paulo Freire: Lessons in transformative praxis. In P. Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, politics and pedagogy* (pp. 35 - 42). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies*. Dunedin: Otago Press.
- Spickard, P. R., & Burroughs, W. J. (1999). *We are a people: Narrative and multiplicity in constructing ethnic identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1990). Method, methodology and epistemology in feminist research processes. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Feminist praxis research, theory and epistemology in feminist sociology*. (pp. pp 20 - 60). London: Routledge.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2004). *Report of the review of the measurement of ethnicity, June 2004*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Steele, C. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape the intellectual identities and performance of women and African Americans. *American Psychologist*, 52(June), 613-629.

- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1989). After intermarriage: Ethnic identity among mixed heritage Japanese-Americans and Hispanics. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*(51), 507 - 519.
- Stevenson, B. (2004). Te Hoe Nuku Roa: A measure of Maori cultural identity. *He Pukenga Korero*, 8(1), 37-46.
- Stewart-Harawira, M. (1993). Maori: who owns the definition? The politics of cultural identity. *Te Pua* 2, 1 & 2, 27 - 34.
- Stone, G. (1962). Appearance and the self. *Human behavior and social processes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Stonequist, E. V. (1937). *The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Tatum, B. (1992). Talking about ethnic identity, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 1-24.
- Teariki, C., & Spoonley, P. (1992). *The politics and process of research for Maori*. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Thomas, N. (1994). *Colonialism's culture: Anthropology, travel and government*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.
- Thornton, M. C. (1996). Hidden agendas, identity theories, and multiracial people. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multicultural experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 101-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tizard, B., & Phoenix, A. (1993). *Black, white, or mixed race? Race and racism in the lives of young people of mixed parentage*. New York: Routledge.
- Tizard, B., & Phoenix, A. (2002). *Black, white or mixed race? Race and racism in the lives of young people of mixed parentage* (Rev. ed.). London: Routledge.
- Trimble, J., Helms, J., & Root, M. (2003). Social and psychological perspectives on ethnic and racial identity. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 239-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Troyna, B., & Carrington, B. (1990). *Education, racism and reform*. London: Routledge.

- Tucker, M. (1990). Directors foreword. *Out there: Marginalisation and contemporary cultures*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Turner, S. (1999). Settlement as forgetting. In K. Neumann, N. Thomas & H. Erikson (Eds.), *Quicksands: Foundational histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Sydney: University of South Wales Press.
- Valsiner, J. (1995). *Child development within culturally structured environments: Comparative – cultural and constructivist perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Van Meijl, T. (1995). Maori socio-political organisation in pre- and proto-history. *Oceania*, 65, 304-321.
- Van Meijl, T. (1999). Fractured cultures, fragmented identities: coping with traditional culture on post-colonial society. *Journal de las Socite des Oceanistes*, 109(2), 53-70.
- Verma, G. K., & Bagley, C. (1979). *Race, education, and identity*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Walker, R. (1989). Maori identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.). *Culture and identity in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Struggle without end = Ka whawhai tonu matou*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9(4), 331-344.
- Wardle, F. (1989). Children of mixed parentage; how can professionals respond? *Children Today*, 18 (4), 10.
- Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Waters, M. C. (1996). Optional ethnicities: For whites only? In S. Pedraza & R. G. Rumbaut (Eds.), *Origins and destinies: immigration, race and ethnicity in America*. California: Wadsworth.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Webster, A. (2001). *Spiral of values: The flow from survival values to global consciousness: An interpretation of the New Zealand study of values*. Hawera: Alpha Publications.
- Webster, S. (1998). *Patrons of Maori culture: Power, theory and ideology in the Maori renaissance*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

- Weisman, J. (1996). An 'other' way of life: the empowerment of alterity in the inter-racial individual. In M.P.P.Root (Ed.), *The multi-racial experience, racial borders as the new frontier*. California: Sage.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimization of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, C. B. (1999). Claiming a biracial identity: Resisting social constructions of race and culture. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 77(1), 32 - 35.
- Williams, T., & Thornton, M. (1998). Social construction of ethnicity versus personal experience: The case of Afro-Amerasians. *Journal of comparative family studies*, 29(2), 255-267.
- Wilson, A. (1987). *Mixed race children: A study of identity*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Wolfe, P. (1994). Nation and MiscegeNation. *Social Analysis*, (36), 93 - 152.
- Xie, Y., & Goyette, K. (1997). The racial identification of biracial children with one Asian parent: Evidence from the 1990 census. *Social Forces*, 76(2), 547 - 570.
- Yinger, J. M. (1985). Ethnicity. *American review of sociology*, 11, 151-180.
- Young, R. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture, and race*. New York: Routledge.

